Class BS2417
Book .E8B5
1892

Morals of Christ

BY AUSTIN BIERBOWER

Price, 50 cents

ered at the Postoffice, Chicago, as second-class mail matter, May 28, 1891.

S H. KERR & CO., PUBLISHERS, 175 DEARBORN ST., CHICA

Monograph

2195
4298

THE MORALS OF CHRIST

A COMPARISON WITH CONTEMPORANEOUS SYSTEMS

BY

AUSTIN BIERBOWER

AUTHOR OF "THE VIRTUES AND THEIR REASONS," "THE SOCIALISM OF CHRIST," etc.

SECOND EDITION

CHICAGO
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
1892

BS 2417
.E8 B5
1892

COPYRIGHT,
1885,
BY WELLAND E. WOLCOTT.

Transfer
Engineer School Liby.
Aug.12,1931

DONOHUE & HENNEBERRY, Printers and Binders, Chicago.

CONTENTS.

Chapter I.

PAGE.

Departure from the Mosaic Morality:

1. From the Negative to the Positive 7
2. From the Objective to the Subjective..... 22
3. From the Particular to the General..... 32
4. From Conduct to Character 37
5. From Penalties to Rewards..... 44
6. From Authority to Reason 47
7. From the Political to the Social..... 51
8. From the Priestly to the Lay..... 58
9. From the National to the Cosmopolitan 62
10. From the Provisional to the Permanent..... 67

Chapter II.

Departure from the Pharisaic Morality:

1. From Ceremonies to Practical Virtues..... 81
2. From Sacramentarianism to Common Sense..... 89
3. From Trivial Distinctions to Real Differences..... 93
4. From Circumstantials to Substantials..... 102
5. From Tradition to Experience..... 108
6. From Exclusiveness to Charity 114
7. From Proselytism to Fraternization..... 123

Chapter III.

PAGE.

Departure from the Græco-Roman Morality:

1. From the Interest of the Fortunate to that of the Unfortunate; and herein:
   - (*a*) From the Rich to the Poor 129
   - (*b*) From the Strong to the Weak..... 148
   - (*c*) From the Intellectual to the Simple..... 155
   - (*d*) From the Learned to the Illiterate..... 159
   - (*e*) From the Bold to the Meek 166
   - (*f*) From the Prepossesing to the Ill-Favored.... 168
   - (*g*) From the Happy to the Suffering..... 171
   - (*h*) From the Few to the Many..... 173
2. From the Interest of Self to that of Others; and herein:
   - (*a*) From the Individual to his Fellows 174
   - (*b*) From Family to Neighbors..... 179
   - (*c*) From Friends to Strangers 182
   - (*d*) From Country to the World..... 183
3. From Hardiness to Kindliness; and herein:
   - (*a*) From Indifference to Love 185
   - (*b*) From Revenge to Forgiveness..... 190
   - (*c*) From Opposition to Non-Resistance..... 191
   - (*d*) From Interested to Disinterested Benevolence 193

CHAPTER I.

DEPARTURE FROM THE MOSAIC MORALITY.

THE MORALS OF CHRIST.

CHAPTER I.

DEPARTURE FROM THE MOSAIC MORALITY.

1. From the Negative to the Positive.

In announcing his morality, Christ took three departures from other systems—one from the Mosaic, one from the Pharisaic, and one from the Græco-Roman—these being the three moral systems of his time and country—the moral systems respectively of his ancestral religion, of its then principal sect, and of the outside world. Every utterance of Jesus bearing on morals was spoken in contemplation of one or other of these classes. In departing from the Mosaic morality, he sought to develop morality from its primitive rudeness and simplicity; in departing from the Pharisaic morality, he sought to recall it from a ritualistic divergence to the proper subjects of morality; and in departing from the Græco-Roman morality, he

sought to substitute the tender for the heroic virtues. His object, accordingly, as viewed from these three points of departure, was, respectively, to fulfill, to correct, and to supplant; or, to effect an extension, a reformation, and a revolution. He sought to extend the Mosaic morality because it was inadequate; to correct the Pharisaic morality because it was corrupt, and to supplant the Græco-Roman morality because it was radically bad; so that he made a departure from the imperfect, from the degenerate, and from the wrong, and a departure toward a more comprehensive, a more practical, and a more generous morality.

I purpose in this essay to set forth the morality of Christ as a departure from these three representative types of morality, it being this triple departure, more than anything absolute, on which he put his chief emphasis, and which, more than anything original, characterized his system. I shall speak first of his departure from the Mosaic morality.

The most general difference between the Mosaic morality and that of Christ is, that the former is simple and unelaborated, contemplating the most primary and elementary conduct of men, and the latter highly developed and differentiated, adapting itself to the varied and minute

exigencies of an enlightened civilization. The Mosaic morality expresses the moral thought of the infancy of our race, the morality of Christ that of its manhood or maturity; the former being, like the other mental products of its time, ancient in its characteristics, and the latter, modern or pre-mediæval.

As the substance of the Mosaic morality, or, at least, its summary characteristics, is contained in the Ten Commandments, and that of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount—which are respectively the moral quintessence of the Old and New Testaments—I shall, in this comparison, deal largely with these productions, though not confining myself to them.

Descending to particulars, the first special difference between the Mosaic morality and that of Christ, and particularly between the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount, is, that the former is negative and the latter positive. The former tells us what we are not to do; the latter what we are to do. The former accordingly runs in the negative, *Thou shalt not;* the latter in the positive, *Thou shalt*, or *Thus shalt thou.* The former is: "Thou shalt *not* have any other gods before me"; "Thou shalt *not* make unto thee any graven image"; "Thou shalt *not*

bow down to them, nor serve them"; "Thou shalt *not* take the name of the Lord thy God in vain"; "Thou shalt *not* do any work" on the Sabbath; "Thou shalt *not* kill"; "Thou shalt *not* commit adultery"; "Thou shalt *not* steal"; "Thou shalt *not* bear false witness"; "Thou shall *not* covet." The only one of the Ten Commandments which is positive, is the fifth, "Honor thy father and thy mother"; but this even is positive only in form, its meaning being, "Thou shalt not have thine own way as against thy parents"; which is restraint instead of an order. The morality of Christ, on the other hand, expresses itself in positive forms: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." "Give to him that asketh, and from him that would borrow turn not thou away." Even when he summarizes the negative commands themselves, he transforms them into positive; as in the first example just given: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind"; and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

For, he says, "On these two commandments (positive) hang all the Law and the Prophets" (negative); or, when he generalizes still farther these same commandments into the Golden Rule —one positive precept—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them; and so fulfill the Law and the Prophets."

The Mosaic morality said, in substance, Do nothing that is wrong; the morality of Christ, Do everything that is right. The substance of the former is, Thou shalt do no evil; that of the latter, Thou shalt do good; the substantial command of the former, Thou shalt not hate; that of the latter, Thou shalt love; the principle of the former, justice; that of the latter, benevolence. The Ten Commandments might more appropriately be called the Ten Prohibitions; while the Sermon on the Mount is the real commandment. In the Old Testament there was restraint and warning put upon the moral man; in the New, liberty and impulse. In the former man was a slave, under bonds against vice; in the latter he is free, under incentives to virtue. The Mosaic morality said substantially, Do nothing in morality, lest it be an injury; the Christian morality said, Do something in morality, since it may be good.

While thus, therefore, nearly everything in the

Mosaic morality is negative, Christ's morality is a mass of positive qualities and duties. The key-note of his morality, as expressed in the Sermon on the Mount, is something to be, and something to do: "Blessed," he says, "are they which hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed are the peace-makers: for they shall be called the children of God,"—all positive and active qualities which are to be aggressive, instead of merely passive, and to do good instead of merely be harmless. "Ye are the salt of the earth," he continues in the same vein of aggression, and warns them that if the salt have lost its savor it is good for nothing. "Ye are the light of the world," he says, and tells them that like a city on a hill they cannot be hid, but like a candle in a candle-stick they are to give light, and not be put under a bushel. "Let your light so shine before men," he continues, "that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven." "Work while it is day, for the night cometh when no man can work." "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." He calls them as laborers into the harvest field, where "the harvest," he says, "is

great and the laborers are few." He recognizes that there is a work to do in the moral realm, and that men are qualified to do it. The kingdom of heaven, or Golden Age of morality, which he is to usher in, is compared to a vineyard in which they are to be workers, not idlers; fruitful trees, not barren cumberers of the ground; to talents which they are to improve, not neglect; money which they are to increase, not bury in a napkin; cities and kingdoms which they are to aggrandize, not leave to decay,—all active processes in opposition to mere passive behavior. The cause of morality in his hands is to enlarge, and not preserve a mere defensive integrity. Like a grain of mustard seed, it is to grow, and like a tree in the forest it is to become a great force among the forces of the world. Like a little leaven, it is to leaven the whole lump of society; and like a stone in the mountains, it is to grow to a mountain itself, and cover the whole earth. It is, in short, a force instead of a dead fact, and something positive instead of something negative; in all which transposition from a negative to a positive morality, he says he does not make void the inactive Mosaic morality, but only extends it. "I came," he says, "not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfill," and "Not one jot or tittle shall

pass till all be fulfilled." He gave life, in short, to dead regulation, and put motive into ethical science.

Christ, as an example of his own morality, and an embodiment of his own ideal, went about doing good. He healed the sick and disabled, fed the hungry, and comforted the distressed. He was so good that he seemed to break the Ten Commandments in his vigorous moral energy; as when he healed on the Sabbath, and protected the adultress. The commands which he gave to his followers were likewise to *do* good, instead of merely to *be* good. He advises him that has two coats to give to him that has none; to give to him that asks, and from him that would borrow to turn not away; to sell what you have and give alms; to part with your goods for the benefit of the poor, and in general to give up your life and your possessions for others. The good Samaritan is his ideal; and, after rehearsing his deeds of mercy, he says, "Go and do likewise." He introduces charity among the graces, sacrifices among the virtues, and opens up a new department of duties, namely, duties to others, which had before been confined mainly to self. He put morality in our work, instead of our suffrance, and gave men duties to do as well as rights to recognize.

Not only is justice to be done in morality, but misery is to be relieved. The misfortunes of mankind are to be mitigated by effortful work and sacrifice; the care of the poor is to be taken partly off themselves, and put upon the rich; the burden of the weak is to be taken partly off themselves and put upon the strong. Men are to recognize not only others' rights, but also their wants; and not only to do them no injury, but to see that no injury is suffered by them. They are to guard others against getting evil, instead of merely guarding themselves against committing it. Whereas the substance of the Mosaic morality was to do nothing that would increase the evils of the world, that of Christ is to wipe out those evils; whereas the former was merely a lawful march through the world, as a tourist through a foreign country, in respectful obedience to the laws, that of Christ is a warlike expedition, designed to conquer the enemy's country. Morality in the system of Christ is a work, not merely a behavior. Man is to *do* the will of his Father, and not merely permit it. It is the doers of God's words, or moral precepts, and not merely the respectful hearers, that are to be approved; the former being likened to a house built upon a rock, and the latter to one built upon the sand.

Christ's is the only system where the whole people, and not the priests or leaders only, are to engage in active morality. There have been other systems for an active propagation of morality, but they have generally been against the people instead of by the people; intended to keep the masses down and under, instead of giving them more power; and to control them instead of putting the work in their hands. In Christ's system the people are to do good, or to take religion into their own hands. Here, in short, morality is for the first time to do good by the immediate subjects of it, instead of to imitate priests in ceremonies and masters in precepts. It is to do something that all can do, and not merely the leaders; and do originally, and not by imitation. It is lay instead of clerical; popular instead of professional; a life instead of a philosophy; and an art instead of a science.

Instead of conformity to religious ceremonies or civil laws, morality in Christ's system consists in acts. Everyone is himself an official, or priest, with something to do. It is popular and individual effort in religion, instead of passive nonresistance; an effort by everybody that is to be moral, or a pure democracy in morals—a system which contemplates the supremacy of the people, and independence of the individual.

The precepts of Christ are accordingly to act, not to live; to do good, not merely to be good. Good works for the first time come into prominence under Christianity. It is no longer to obey laws, but to do tasks, that constitute morality. For, as patriotism in these later times consists not merely in obeying rulers and laws, but in voting and making such rulers and laws, morality is taken largely out of the reign of obedience and submission, and put into that of activity and creation, in which the common people are in coequal authority with masters and priests. Christ draws this distinction plainly, and tells the people that a following of the law is not sufficient in morals, but that his system demands something more. "Unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharises," he says, (which righteousness was made up of an observance of the law), "ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven"; in short, unless it takes on a positive and active form, instead of a mere passive and negative one.

In the Christian morality, as we have said, men are free, not slaves; they are let loose, not restrained; set on, not curbed. It is a bursting of bands, and an investing of men with power. They are to run, to fight, to triumph, and not to be prisoners of mor-

ality or idlers in conduct, where they can simply do no harm. Act, is the substance of Christ's commands, where you can do most; and do not put yourself in abeyance where you can do least. Seek the highest good; not the minimum of evil. Do all you can; and do not refrain from all you can. Men's actions are supposed to be good, not bad; and hence Christ demands more of them, whereas Moses demanded less.

Under the new dispensation man is supposed to be a different being from what he was under the Mosaic; whether it be that he is regarded from a more charitable standpoint, or is believed to have changed his nature; so that his deeds are now thought to be good instead of bad. In old times the fall of man was nearer to the peoples' thoughts; the corruption of the race being too fresh in the mind to allow them to suppose the acts of men to be good. In Christ's time, however, the thought of a redemption was recent, and the idea of a race converted back to God was strong with them. Hence, with this new nature, morality is naturally recognized as changing from negative to positive. Men, accordingly, are taught to do all they can, instead of merely to keep from evil; and to be active and influential instead of merely preserving themselves pure.

In the Christian morality men are moral agents, instead of moral subjects; moral masters, instead of moral slaves; moral rulers, instead of moral ruled; the subject, instead of the object of moral aim; and in general the party that is to work, and not the party that is to be worked upon.

The Ten Commandments were to be kept; the commandments of Christ were to be done. Of the former it was said, "Blessed is he that keepeth my commandments"; of the latter, "Blessed is he that doeth my will."

Moses said, Let your brother alone; Christ said, Do good to your brother. The interrogatory of the Old Testament, "Am I my brother's keeper?" is answered in the affirmative in the New. Moses taught indifference to man, except as to his rights. Christ taught solicitude for him even to his desires. The former kept man off from man; the latter threw him upon him. The former would keep mortals apart as enemies; the latter would bring them together as friends.

Under Moses morality was but a rule of conduct; under Christ it was a motive. Under the former it was laid on man as a restraint; under the latter it was put upon him as a force. Under the former it was a law circumscribing his action; under the latter it is an impulse exciting him to

act. While, therefore, under the former morality repressed man's nature, under the latter it excites it.

In turning morality from negative into positive, Christ was the first to elevate morality to a distinct business or interest. Under Moses, morality was only an accompaniment of right action in no matter what department of life. Under Christ it became a species of work or activity in itself. Moses considered it a proper conduct in the relations of secular life ; Christ, a distinct sphere of sacred employment, with its objects, its methods, and its practical results. While the Jews, whatever else they attempted to do, rarely attempted to do good, Christ made "doing good" the characteristic of Christians. While Moses said, virtually, In your secular dealings be honest, truthful and just, Christ said, Besides your secular dealings, energize yourself in good works for the benefit of others.

While under Moses morality was at most only a rendering of dues to others, under Christ it was to be gratuitous. Moses allowed men a kind of pay for their morality; Christ required them to do good for nothing. Moses said, if you do your duty you are moral; Christ said, your morality begins to count only after you have done

your duty. "For if ye give only as much as ye have received, what thank have ye?" or, "if ye give expecting to receive as much again"; "for do not sinners do the same?" But give expecting to receive nothing; lend expecting not to get it back again.

Moses required one to do only as much as was pleasurable or natural to him, or as could be done without loss to himself. Christ required more, alleging that morality begins only after you have begun to sacrifice. While Moses said, Love your friends, Christ said, Love also your enemies. "For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners do the same." You must, according to Christ, transcend both justice and natural affection before moral merit begins. Love strangers; love aliens; love Samaritans even; love the whole race. Kiss the hand that strikes you. Bless the man that curses you. Do good to the one who maltreats you. Bless and curse not. Do good, and do no evil. In short, leap over human nature in your morality, and make your love surmount your taste as well as your passion, and, if need be, fix it on the hostile and the unlovely, loving not only your enemy and the evil-doer, but also the poor, the unfortunate, and the unsightly. In short, morality under Christ is

to be gratuituous, at our own expense, and of the nature of a sacrifice, and not merely an enjoyment of our own nature in its proper use.

So much for the positive character of Christ's morality, as distinguished from the negative character of the Mosaic morality.

2. From the Objective to the Subjective.

A second difference between the morality of Moses and that of Christ is, that the former is objective, and the latter subjective; the former looking to the outward conduct, and the latter to the internal state. Moses had regard to the act, Christ to the thought; the former to the effect, the latter to the cause.

Thus the Ten Commandments all prohibit external acts, while the Sermon on the Mount commands internal conditions. The former are: Thou shalt not kill; Thou shalt not steal; Thou shalt not commit adultery; Thou shalt not bear false witness; Thou shalt not work on the Sabbath; Thou shalt not make graven images; Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor serve them; Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, and (in substance), Thou shalt not dishonor thy parents. The only exception is the

tenth commandment, Thou shalt not covet. But even this looked to the desire as liable to lead to the act; since the things that were specified as not to be coveted—an ox, an ass, a servant, and a wife —were such as were liable to be lost by theft or seduction. The whole Mosaic code is one of outward act in morality and of ceremony in religion.

The Sermon on the Mount, on the other hand, and Christ's utterances in general, have almost exclusive reference to subjective states. Thus the Beatitudes all express conditions of mind, and none of them external acts: "Blessed," says Christ, "are the *poor in spirit;* for their's is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are the *meek;* for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are the *merciful;* for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the *pure in heart;* for they shall see God. Blessed are they that *mourn;* for they shall be comforted. Blessed are they which do *hunger and thirst* after righteousness; for they shall be filled." And, in interpreting the Ten Commandments themselves, he extends the principle beyond the act and makes it apply to the state of mind allied to the act: as when, speaking of the sixth commandment, he says, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old, Thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say

unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment," etc. And, in interpreting the seventh commandment, he says: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." He further says, as an inward extension of the old law, "Be reconciled to thy brother," "Agree with thine adversary," "Love thine enemy," and, in general, "Be perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect"—all commanding states of mind and replacing commands for outward acts.

So, also, in general, his precepts concern mental states instead of bodily acts, Christ never emphasizing the latter. Thus, he says, "Be ye merciful as your Father also is merciful; judge not, and ye shall not be judged; condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven,"—all expressive of internal states. "A good man," he says, "out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good, and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil; for of the abundance of his heart his mouth speaketh." He

is constantly asking his hearers to cleanse the inner man, and condemns the Pharisees because they look only after the outer, while "inwardly they are full of dead men's bones." He asks men not to judge according to the appearance, but to give righteous judgment. He sums up all the Law and the Prophets, as amended by himself, in one mental state—love—and says, in answering the lawyer, who asked him which is the greatest commandment in the law, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments—internal—hang all the Law and the Prophets—external." In short the morality of Christ is an emphasis of the importance of the internal or subjective in morality.

In taking this position Jesus worked a manifold extension of the old Jewish morality. Leaving the simple act, and dealing with the heart and the mind, he aimed to get men to wish nothing bad, as well as to do nothing bad; to think nothing bad, as well as to attempt nothing bad. Moses had, perhaps, gotten so far as to protest against wishing anything bad; as in the command

against coveting. But Christ taught further that men should not think evil, even when they did not wish to do it; or that there should be nothing bad in the mind even when disassociated from motive power, and not contemplating action. The mind is to be kept pure, not only as a preventive against evil acts, which might otherwise issue out of it, but also on account of itself, the state of the mind being an ultimate object of morality, as well as the acts proceeding therefrom. Many have thoughts which they would not like to have go into acts, or in any way take appearance or be known, and many others are anxious, for various reasons, to keep the evil in their thoughts entirely. Christ's extension of morality is intended to include these thoughts also as evil, and to condemn them as subjects of morality.

Christ wished to get morality closer in the person, especially at a time when there was a tendency to put it, like religion, into men's circumstances. For, as religion could be thought to consist in ceremonies, and irreligion in the neglect of them, so morality and immorality came to be thought of as formal acts which could take place only after they had got out of the mind into the world, or where they could take on the perceptible form of conduct. Christ, however, taught that

morality is in the mind, behind all these manifestations; in the man and not out of him; in that which is responsible for the act—the man exclusively—and not in the act itself (which is partly made up of the outside world).

Christ wished in this idea to also get morality in the individual, so as to be determinable by his own circumstances, and not by the average circumstances which make up right and wrong for men as a whole. He wished each one to be judged by a personal standard, instead of a general one, thereby establishing a private responsibility instead of a public one, with a standard which recognizes more minute conditions of right and wrong than those which determine moral qualities in general for all classes and for all cases of conduct; a standard in whose more minute measurements there are other rights and wrongs than the formal ones universally recognized as virtues and vices, which could only be very few and very obvious. Christ was not willing to let the large class of private virtues and vices pass without characterization, because they could not be stamped with certain and uniform designations; but he laid his hand on the mind as the seat of morality, and proclaimed that the infinite combinations of thought which cannot be desig-

nated or permanently distinguished by language, may, in a thousand permutations and modifications, which the individual can make for himself, unnamed and unprecedented, it may be, constitute virtues and vices.

Christ taught in his internal morality that the man is important. He looked to the good of the person, not of the result; of the individual, not of society; of the doer, not of the deed. The man who does the deed is concerned in morality more than those who are affected by it. It is the rightness or the sin, not the advantage or the disadvantage that is chiefly contemplated. Christ's is a personal, not a general morality, and is a system for the advantage of the agent rather than of the public.

In the early ages of the world and early stages of civilization men were naturally objective and formal. Subsequently, as they became more highly developed, they became more reflective. At first they recognized only an outer world, or world of sensible objects and immediate experience; subsequently an inner world was recognized, or world of laws and principles. The morality of Christ is a morality of the inner world, just as that of Moses was a morality of the outer world.

The mind was to be the arena of Christ's moral-

ity, not society. The good and the bad were to be determined before the matter should pass out of the thought into the act. In the mind the moral conflicts were to be fought and judged, and nothing was thenceforth to be good or bad, except the mental states.

The merit of virtue, according to Christ, was to be in having the state of mind necessary for virtue; not in the deeds or in the doing of them. It was to be in the cause, not in the effect, in the sentimental, not in the practical.

Though the good will be undeniably attained by Christ's morality, yet it will be esteemed in the individual not because good, but because indicative of good. Though evil action is immoral, it is so because of the state of mind necessary to do it. It takes a bad being to produce a bad result; and the evil is not in the action, but in the state of mind. The work itself is not bad, but the spirit in which it is done, or which can do it. We have no immoral acts, but actions. The possibility of evil in man is what is bad. A mind that *can* sin is about as bad as one that does; and Christ wished to make men so that they would be incapable of sin, and not merely guiltless of it. Jesus insisted on general rules and states of mind—a universal condition of morality instead of a special one.

This subjective morality, however, is not negative, and is not to be confounded with the Mosaic morality, just spoken of, which consists in doing nothing bad as contradistinguished from doing good. It is something positive. Moses said merely, Behave yourself. Christ said, Do something good, and also, *Be* something good. While Christians are to do good, they are not to suppose that their morality consists in their deeds (good works), but in the state of mind which one ordinarily has when he does such deeds, and particularly in having this state of mind; for the good deeds can be done without having the state of mind which generally accompanies such deeds, and which we here call the proper state of mind; while a good mind is not only a permanent condition of good, but a better guarantee of good deeds than the simple practice of such deeds. Hence it is that Christ emphasizes the conversion of the individual to a good man, and not the doing of good deeds in a bad state.

Christ's is a conscious morality. The mind, in it, is to take cognizance of its own states. It is highly intellectual, requiring self-consciousness, or inward reflection, for its observation, rather than outward perception—a morality founded as a system on pscyhology rather than on empirical life, on orig-

inality of thought rather than on imitation of deed.

Such morality as is exercised in keeping from stealing, lying, killing and committing adultery is very low; just as these sins are very low, and suppose a very low grade of mind. As long as one has to battle against these primary vices, he cannot exercise the highly developed virtues, or more sensitive graces, which are mounted to only after great attainments in morality. A man comes to the highest kind of morals only when he makes the fine distinctions—as minute as the metaphysician's—which are contained in the subtler questions of perfect love, or absolute hatelessness.

In general, therefore, Christ's morality is subjective, and not objective. He taught that as a man thinketh so is he, and not as he acteth; that the soul is the man for moral as well as for intellectual and practical purposes, and not what a man does. Morality means the mind in its right thoughts. Moral merit has to do with the quality of thought. For, though wrong action cannot proceed from a right mind, right action can proceed from a mind that is not doing right.

3. From the Particular to the General.

The third special difference between the Mosaic morality and that of Christ is, that the former is particular and the latter general; the former specifying particular sins to be avoided or virtues to be cultivated, and the other laying down general rules and principles which apply alike to many different cases of conduct. Thus Moses says that men should not kill, steal, commit adultery, bear false witness, work on the Sabbath, swear and covet—all particular and specified offenses, which one cannot mistake, and which, like the statutes of the civil law, do not apply to any other cases. Christ, on the other hand, asks them to be "meek," to be "poor in spirit," to "hunger and thirst after righteousness," to be "merciful," to be "pure in heart," to "let their light shine," and in general to "be perfect as their Father in heaven is perfect"—all general precepts which can be followed in one way or another by a great many different processes, according to the circumstances and calculations of the individual.

Christ generalized the whole Ten Commandments into two: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and

with all thy mind"; and, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"; and, at another time, still further generalized them all into one—the Golden Rule—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them." He made that which was particular under Moses general in his own system, and that which was manifold under Moses, single in his own. He compassed each table of Moses' laws in one general principle; the first four in that of love to God, and the other six in that of love to man. He then still further compassed both tables in one, saying that the second is like unto the first, thus expressing all the Ten Commandments, and in fact all the Law and the Prophets, as he says, in the single general principle of conduct toward others—whether God or men—according to what you desire for yourself. He exhibited, in announcing this identity, one of the most remarkable generalizations in all the history of thought.

Christ taught principles of action, not acts. He did not specify what men should do, or point out particular deeds to be done. He laid down general principles from which conduct was to be inferred, and according to which the individual act was to be determined. His principles are such as adapt themselves to all persons and all circumstances,

and are not, like statute law, to have a special application. Christ's morality is to the Mosaic what equity is to the English common law, correcting and supplying the law wherein it is defective by reason of its specialty.

The only instances where Christ seems to give special commands are where it is intended to teach the general by example, or an abstract principle by a concrete case, as when he says: "Let him that hath two coats give to him that hath none"; and, "If a man ask you to go with him a mile, go with him twain"; or when he says that if a man hate not his father and mother he cannot be his disciple. For, if these commands are to be taken as particular, there is no sense in them. They are, therefore, not commands specifying anything in particular, but inculcating general principles.

The observance and consideration of the particular is a lower exercise of thought; and, where it prevails generally, it indicates a low state of intellectual development. Dealing with the general is higher, and requires higher powers of mind and a more advanced condition of the race. The former has to do with facts; the latter with laws. The former is experience, the latter is philosophy. The former looks at things, the latter at the world; the former at disconnected phenomena, the latter

at a cosmos. And when, as Christ has done in this case, the particular facts and precepts are gathered up in general principles by an inductive process, and men so regard them, it bespeaks the highest exercise of moral thought.

The difference between the particular and the general in morality is a difference between disconnected facts and science. The former at best is but common sense; the latter is common sense scientized and philosophized.

In general it requires more freedom of thought and more exercise of mind to use principles so as to get the right action out of them than it does to apply particular commands. In the former one must master the subject and use his discretion in many ways; in the latter he can succeed by merely following a plain rule, which may be that of another. It is one thing to know how not to kill, or work on the Sabbath, and another to know how "not to be angry with our brother without a cause," or to "be perfect, as our Father in heaven is perfect."

Christ says, in effect, by the generalness of his principles: Think for yourself, instead of follow precepts: Be your own master, instead of follow another: Comprehend the subject, and act as an original from the principle, instead of follow

blindly the letter because it is written. Christ proclaimed moral freedom; and his Sermon on the Mount is an emancipation proclamation which leaves us all free men, to do henceforth as we each think best in morals.

And, finally, in this relation, Christ's is a universal morality. The extensiveness of his generalizations makes his principles apply to all subjects of moral conduct and all circumstances of actual life. The commands of Moses apply, as I have said, only to particular well-defined sins. Like those of Confucius, Seneca, and even Socrates, they regarded, generally, some subject of social conduct or commercial wisdom, and would now apply with special relevancy to very few of our cases. But the principles expressed in the commands of Christ, such as, Love thy neighbor as thyself, can be applied to all acts and circumstances whatever; and though they are so simple that all can understand them, and so pertinent that everybody can apply them to his individual case, they are such that they do not need amendment and cannot be added to for completeness. They are a marvel in moral precepts, almost as great a miracle as any wonder claimed for him; as "Resist not evil," "Love your enemies. Bless them which curse you. Do good to them which despitefully use

you and persecute you." "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them." To be exhaustively great, and intensely individual, is the highest capability of thought, and gives universality and immortality to its products.

4. From Conduct to Character.

The next difference to be noted between the Mosaic morality and that of Christ is, that the former prescribes conduct, and the latter character; the former having in view proper living, and the latter a proper nature; so that while the former is satisfied with an uprightness of life the latter requires also a permanent disposition thereto.

The Ten Commandments, accordingly, all concern conduct, as, Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not bear false witness. Thou shalt not work on the Sabbath. Thou shalt not make any graven images. Thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. Thou shalt (in substance) honor thy parents; and, Thou shalt not covet,—all subjects of conduct and not of character, or matters of action instead of personal inclination.

Christ, on the other hand, prescribed dispositions, traits, or permanent qualities; as when he commends the pure in heart, the meek and the merciful; and when he says, "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." His idea is, not to avert evil when it is about to take place, or to force good where there is no inclination for it; but to take out defects by the roots, and to plant good as an indigenous tree for natural growth. He therefore emphasizes character instead of conduct. "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart," he says, "bringeth forth good things; and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things." "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit; neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." "Either make the tree good and his fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt." He wants his morality founded on a rock, built in and fastened to our nature, so that when winds and rain and floods come, and circumstances change, it will remain on a permanent foundation. The faculty must be right, and not its functions only. "If thine eye be single thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil thy whole body shall be full of darkness." It is not a question of the mere sight; but of the

eye. The organ must be good, the morality of Christ tolerating no vicious members. "If thy right eye offend thee," he says, contemplating a radical excision of the faculty instead of the evil, "pluck it out, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee cut it off, and cast it from thee"—for the same reason. The offending part, or evil tendency, is not to be merely checked or turned from evil, but replaced by that which is spontaneously good,—a good plant in good soil,—rooted in the heart's depths, like seed in good ground—a natural growth native to the soul.

Moses' morality said, Do; Christ's morality said, Be. It is a difference of doing and not doing on the one hand, and of being and not being on the other. Mosaic morality calls for works, Christ's for qualification. The former says, Earn heaven; the latter, Be fit for it.

Mosaic morality contains in itself the idea of reward for virtue; a reward as for services rendered, as if you were working for another. Christ's contains the idea of working for self-interest, or for pleasure as one's own. From Moses' point of view man is an employe in mor-

ality; from Christ's he is the proprietor. Moses considers virtue somebody else's interest, Christ the man's own. Moses looks at it as a matter instigated by some power outside of man; Christ as something having its reason and nature in him; so that while in Moses' view man is immoral, and has to have morality put upon him by objectively imposed rules, in Christ's he is considered as moral, or capable of being so, with morality springing up within, like a well, as he says, of water in himself, and not a perpetual drawing or drinking from another's source. In short, while Moses regards man as a moral machine, to be moved by another person, or by a consideration or authority from without, Christ regards him as automatic,—a self-feeder, or perpetual-motion arrangement, that has all things in itself for going aright.

As practice gives character, and character insures practice, the first of these (practice) was more properly emphasized in the earlier stages of man's development, when Moses laid down his morality. The latter became imperative in later times, after there had been much experience, and when habits, or fixed moral characteristics were supposed to have appeared. The first served as an aid to work up the latter,—a good provisional state to prepare for a permanent one.

Conduct is the stuff—the warp and woof—from which character is made. Character is the woven fabric, or resultant of such material and processes. There is a transmutation of our conduct into character; a sort of inductive consolidation or body of inferences petrified, in which all our life-deeds are held as a resultant in our person. Our acts are incarnated in our nature. It is this permanent possibility of good that Christ sought, and not the actual good that might be brought forth.

Jesus desired that morality should be produced from the substance of self, and should express the man. If the man is not right, there can be no calculating from whence his moral actions proceed, or what is their moral worth. Conduct can be assumed; character cannot. The former may be put on as a man's dress, the latter must be part of the person. Christ wished, therefore, to have morality express something at the root and foundation of man; his substance and individuality, not his accidentals and fashions—something in which he is an individual, not in which he is common with all others.

He taught also that moral action should flow from our nature, and not be taken on as adventitious; a spontaneous outworking from the inner

man, and not a taking up of something from without; a manifestation of self, and not a reflection of anything else; a part of the man, and not a borrowing from outside; an original expression, and not an imitated copy.

He contemplated, as the best security for morality, a moral nature, or physical and intellectual formation by which one, from his own natural impulses, should incline to do good rather than evil, and to do it when not thinking about it, or wishing to do it, but merely because he is driven thereto by his blood and animal spirits,—a moral nature instead of moral considerations, and moral impulses instead of moral convictions—which is, after all, what constitutes the really moral man.

For, having a moral nature, after this ideal of Christ, one thereby does good because he wants to, and not because he thinks he ought to,—in obedience to his inclinations, and not his conscience. His good is in his constitution, and not in his opinions or scruples. He wants to do good as being more agreeable than doing otherwise, and he enjoys his morality rather than feels it as a sacrifice. He is loving, kind and accommodating, which is the most natural expression of his disposition,—in short, is literally a "good-natured"

man, or man good by nature, or physical construction. So decidedly do the precepts of Christ aim at this character, and so directly does their practice tend to produce it, that he speaks of the change which takes place in passing from a bad man to a good one as a new birth, or radical reconstruction; by which the old moral nature is exchanged, and a new nature put in its place, which, instead of being spontaneously bad, is spontaneously good.

And finally, touching this emphasis of character, Christ wished to make morality a means of culture as well as a guarantee of conduct; an agency for the elevation of man as well as for his regulation. For moral conduct will elevate one in several ways: as, by giving him purer intellections and finer feelings; by keeping him physically healthy and vigorous, and by making him socially high-minded and elegant. Accordingly Christ set up morality as a group of graces, rather than as a code of actions, and as a set of attainments, rather than as a multitude of proceedings ending with themselves. It was the reflex on the permanent agent, rather than the effect on the immediate object that he sought. Morality in his mind was to be something in which there could be advancement, and in which society as

well as the individual could advance, and advance through the ages as well as through a lifetime.

5. From Penalties to Rewards.

The next difference between the Mosaic morality and that of Christ is, that the former is sought to be enforced principally by threats, and the latter by inducements; the former working on our fears, and the latter on our hopes. Moses represented his commands as backed by penalties, Christ as followed by rewards. The morality of Moses was of the nature of law, that of Christ of the nature of consideration. The former had its punishments prescribed; the latter its advantages submitted. "Cursed," said Moses, in effect, "is he that continueth not in all things in the law to do them." "Blessed," said Christ, "is he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven"; the former breaking out with, *Maledicti!* and the latter with, *Benedicti!*

The Mosaic morality is accordingly announced under such terrors as, "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God," "For the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain," for the Lord "will visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth genera-

tion of them that hate him," etc.; and in general it is announced that the violation of law will be followed by deterring penalties.

The morality of Christ, on the other hand, is proclaimed with blessings: "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God"—in short, Blessed are the good: for they shall have their reward. Every command of Christ lies between a beatitude and a promise; as if he said: Blessed are ye—be poor in spirit—for yours is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye—be meek—for ye shall inherit the earth. Blessed are ye—be merciful—for ye shall obtain mercy. Blessed are ye—be poor in heart—for ye shall see God. In short, it is "Blessed—for," "Blessed—for," from beginning to end; while the duties are concealed between the promises, and the burdens hidden under the pleasures.

The Ten Commandments we find were accord-

ingly given with the appropriate attendants of thunder and lightning, of fire and smoke, and of clouds and darkness. The people were afraid, and stood afar off. Their God came like the night, rolling the darkness and the noises about his head, as when he came in the pestilence to Troy. The giving of the Law was a scene to terrify and repel, and the people were afraid of the God whom they served, and tried to get away from him that they might please him.

The morality of Christ, on the other hand, is announced with winsome wooings and invitations: "Come unto me," he says, "all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." "Come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Come see; come taste; come drink; come live. His messenger announces him with a *Gloria in Excelcis*, and promises peace on earth and good will to men. "And I," he says of himself, "if I be lifted up will draw all men unto me."

The morality of Moses seems to make proclamation to the people, Your God is coming: make way; that of Christ, Your God is coming: draw near. The former says, Fall back that he may pass; the latter, Crowd up that you may touch

him. The former would have men avoid his curse; the latter would have them catch his blessing.

In general the morality of Moses was founded on a fear of the evils of immorality; that of Christ on the hope of the good of morality; the first being an economic consideration, the latter a cultural ambition.

6. From Authority to Reason.

The next difference between the morality of Moses and that of Christ is, that the former contemplates men as acting blindly in morality, the latter as acting with full possession of the reason therefor; the former as merely following a recognized authority, the latter as judicially deciding their course for themselves. Moses gave commands; Christ gave arguments. The Ten Commandments were authoritative; the Sermon on the Mount discursive. The *why* of morality was brought out by Jesus; and men were expected thenceforth not only to act right, but to act with a full knowledge of what they were doing, and a full conviction of its importance. Duty was to be made an interest in which man as well as God was to be an advisory party. Christ accord-

ingly follows up his commands with a defense,—his "*Do this*," with a "*For*."

Thus, in the Sermon on the Mount, after asking men to forgive, he says, "For if ye forgive not men their trespasses neither will your heavenly Father forgive your trespasses." After advising them to take no thought for the morrow, he says, "For the morrow will take thought of the things of itself." After recommending them not to swear, he says, "For by so doing ye cannot make one hair black or white." After urging them to love their enemies and bless them which curse them, he gives as a reason, that so they shall be children of their Father which is in heaven. "For he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust." After advising them not to make long prayers, he says, "For your father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him."

Thus the Beautitudes in particular, which contain each a command, a blessing and a promise, contain also each a reason. "Blessed," says Christ, "are the poor in spirit: *for* theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn: *for* they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek: *for* they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness:

for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful: *for* they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart: *for* they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers: *for* they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: *for* theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad: *for* great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."

In fact, the whole Sermon on the Mount bristles with "*fors*" and "*wherefores*," setting forth some reason, either of logical consequence, of personal interest, or of general utility in the object sought. "*For* what earthly parent, if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?" "*For* with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again." "*For* it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell." "*For* your heavenly father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." "*For* if God so clothe the grass, which to-day is, and to-morrow is not, will he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" "*For* where your treasure is there will your heart be also."

Christ's is an intelligent morality, backed by reasons drawn from nature or from our admitted beliefs, or by appeals made to our consciousness or our experience. He taught that men are to be good, not from precept, but from sufficient consideration; and that they should be convinced as well as persuaded. He accordingly argues instead of commands, speaking *ex ratione* instead of *ex cathedra;* and appeals to the mind, and not to the conscience only.

He gives, as we have already said, rules requiring intelligence for their application; so that to apply them aright one must know the reason, and so go, not by the letter, but by the spirit. They are not simple rules like, Thou shalt not kill, or steal, or commit adultery, which are so plain that a man can obey them without thought, but complex rules, like, "Love your enemies," and "Take no thought for the morrow," which require a comprehensive view to understand and a critical discrimination to practice.

In Christ's morality there is much latitude and discrimination allowed. The mind itself is to determine, from a knowledge of the nature of right and wrong, whether an act is to be done or not. The commands of Christ are not the ultimate in his morality, but the constitution of nature and

society on which they are founded. This constitution of nature and society—the determining ground of morality—he points out as the reason for his commands; for he habitually gives a reason. His is a morality founded on nature, and not on authority or whim; and he would have this fact recognized by the doer of his morality.

Christ never asked men to do or accept his sayings on his word only, but on his proofs. He enforced them with miracles or evidence of some kind. If he spake as one having authority, it was as contradistinguished from the Scribes, who spake from writ (the Old Testament or tradition) like the school-men from Aristotle. He gave reasons, not texts, for his morality. As, therefore, Moses said, "Thus saith the Lord," Christ said, "But I say unto you"; and then gave reasons why he followed neither Moses nor his commentators. "*For* which of you," etc. Christ appealed to man's intelligence to contradict tradition, and asked each one to put himself on an equality with every authority, and to see for himself what is good and right.

7. From the Political to the Social.

The next difference between the morality of Moses and that of Christ is, that the former is po-

litical and the latter social; the former looking to the advantage of the state, the latter to that of the people; the former, therefore, having a state purpose, and the latter a popular purpose. Morality in olden times, and especially under the Jewish system, was calculated to enable the rulers to control the people, and therefore, was a sentiment fostered against the people and in the interest of the rulers. It taught principally such duties as submission, obedience, loyalty, order, and the virtues which respect the property of the rich and the power of the great: as, thou shalt not kill, steal, and bear false witness, and, thou shalt honor thy father and mother, and keep the Sabbath; all of which looked to the preservation and prosperity of the state and the advantage and ease of the rulers; much as the state morality inculcated in Europe to-day does, which teaches the people principally to be subordinate and to respect the king and nobles.

Christ, on the other hand, taught that morality was for the people, just as he taught that government was for the people; insisting that they were to get the advantage of being good as well as to have the burden of it; his being a morality of the people and for the people. Its object was to develop the people instead of control them, and

to elevate them instead of keep them down and under; making them happy, peaceful and prosperous in life by mutual aid and respect of rights, as well as personally cultured and susceptible of enjoyment through the virtues as so many graces in themselves. His was a popular morality whose advantages were for the people, or for those who practice it, and not for those who command it; a republicanism of morality for the good of the ruled instead of the rulers, in which all have an interest, and not the few only; a democracy, in short, instead of an oligarchy of morality.

Christ's system was a recognition of popular rights in morality, or a recognition by man of rights in others which he himself possesses, and of no others or other kind; a principle expressed in his most universal law, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," and in the command, "Love thy neighbor as thyself." The man is always to count himself a unit in the society which is to be the realm of morality, and to recognize the perfect reciprocity and universal equality of moral obligation. The morality of Christ is but a keeping of such popular rights,—a recognition of another's equal rights with your own, and then a respecting of them as your own. It is a recognition of rights in others which you

yourself possess, making the individual himself the standard, and transferring to others his rights as the measure of his duties to them. It puts the standard in one of the people, and in every one of them. It contemplates no higher respect for another than for self, just as it contemplates no lower respect. If you recognize any one as above you, or different from you, you are, in so far, not Christian. You cannot love another as you love yourself, or do to him as you would have him do to you unless you have a self-respectful assumption of your own rights. Christ's is a popular, equal and democratic morality, knowing no kings, lords or titled gentry, no superior aristocracy, or anybody but such as you yourself are; and your own rights are to be the measure of your duties, and human equality the foundation of the universality of the moral law.

While, accordingly, Christ recognized the political and civil character of the Mosaic morality as sufficient for ancient state wants, he took issue with it as insufficient for popular and private wants, and established his as supplying and extending it in that direction. Thus he says, referring to the Mosaic law of divorce, "It hath been said, 'Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement'; but I say

unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife saving for the cause of fornication causeth her to commit adultery, and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery"; herein giving the law a private extension, looking to the moral character of the people as well as to the public wants of the state. So, referring to the Mosaic law of oaths, he says, "Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. But I say unto you, swear not at all. * * But let your communication be, yea, yea; nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than this cometh from evil"; herein extending the law of oaths not only to cover state wants, for which it was before amply sufficient, but also to meet private moral demands, which required an extension to private character. So, referring to the laws of justice and of civil penalties, which were generally proper enough for a state, and which, in ancient times, were thought to be commensurate with the law of morality, he says, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at

the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go with him a mile, go with him twain"; thus giving morality a different purpose from its ancient civil one. So, in referring to the Mosaic law, which had regard to the state's policy toward enemies, he said, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you"; thus recognizing in morality other claims than those of the state, and claims which have their origin exclusively with the people. And so, in general, Christ interpreted morality as having its seat and its object in the people; a culture and not a restraint; an aid and not an obstacle; for the individual, and not for the whole; for the subject, and not for the ruler, and for man, and not for God. As Jesus said, "The Sabbath was made for man"; so he impliedly said, The moral law was made for man.

The civil law was formerly supposed to create morality, and so to be commensurate with the moral law, and to express it fully. Christ, however, recognizing that man has rights and wants

which the civil law cannot and ought not to regulate, has sought to make the moral law extend beyond the civil to apply to these cases, thus guaranteeing the more minute and private virtues by the moral law exclusively. The moral law was, in his eyes, given as an unwritten, and almost unuttered code, to enforce the more tender and delicate rights of men, inexpressible in human language. It was put in the more sensitive conscience, where it can be felt, rather than in the blunt intellect, or blunter statute books, where it can be only obtusely perceived. Touching the civil law, therefore, Christ said he came to fulfill or extend it, making that to be perfect which was before fragmentary, and that to be complete which was before partial.

He taught men to take the civil law into their own hands,—as subjects to supplant its necessity by moral conduct, and as administrators to deal with others for their advantage, so as, by rising above its demands not to consciously use it in conduct. Hence he advises us not to go to law, but to do more than the law requires; giving up our cloaks when one would take our coats, and going two miles when one would compel us to go one. He asks us to give more than duty demands, and to yield part of our rights for the

good of others. For, under a good government, one's rights are so many that he need not exercise them all, but can yield many as a free man, not in dishonor, but like the benevolent person who gives to the mendicant what he still owns as a right, but dispenses as a charity. For if your principles and purposes prevail you need not care for your surrender of rights which were originally meant only to secure those purposes.

8. From the Priestly to the Lay.

The next difference between the morality of Moses and that of Christ is that the former is priestly, and the latter lay; the morality of Moses being controlled by ecclesiastics, who are supposed to receive it from God and impart it to the people at second hand; while the morality of Jesus is to be taken up by the people directly who are supposed to be its ultimate investigators and to have the original sources of its authority in themselves. In the Mosaic idea mystery shuts morality up to the priests, while sanctity protects it against investigation; so that the masses cannot understand it and may not try from fear of sacrilege. It was a monopoly or privilege of a class, to be dispensed as a commodity instead of exercised as something

common. One had anciently to get permission to be good, and illicit virtue was almost as bad as illicit vice. The Mosaic idea of morality was that of an instruction to be imparted, a leadership to be followed, a mastery to be submitted to; in which one had to go as he was directed, and to conform to rules outwardly imposed.

The morality of Christ, on the other hand, recognizes man himself as the supreme authority, and the individual as the ultimate inquirer; each having perfect liberty to be good for himself, and the right to determine how to be so. It is a recognition of the fact that the sources of ethics are open to all, and its principles comprehensible by all. Christ proclaimed human liberty in morality, and aimed to sweep away all distinctions which would lock it up from any. He declared it for all men, and all men for it; every man to be a moral man in the highest sense, and every one as a proficient to take hold of ethics for himself.

In the Mosaic morality the idea of a mediator prevailed; in that of Christ the idea of self. Moses had his priests to get virtue ready for the people, and prevent them from having too much of it, or having it at the wrong time, or in the wrong way. Christ did away with middlemen in morality, and told the people to be good themselves, and

not to be afraid of doing wrong in practicing right. The idea of the Mosaic morality was that it came from above down; the idea of Christ's morality that it comes from below up—an induction from the wants of the people. Moses thought that it was an interest of God's, and was practiced for his benefit; Christ, that it was an interest of men's, and practiced for their benefit. As Moses, therefore, received the law from God, and gave it to the people, so he always had a body of priests to represent the interests of God, and stand between him and the people as a broker in the traffic of moral merchandise. Christ spake directly to the people, and not to anybody else for them. God was formerly represented as dealing with the leaders,—with Moses on Sinai and with Aaron in the Holy of Holies; but when he came down in the form of Jesus he did not stop on a mountain, or out of sight with the law-giver or priest, or meet men half way in a body of representatives. He came clear down to the earth, and to the lowest of men, and spake to them directly, and told them each to do what he had to do.

While Moses, therefore, emphasized a mediator, or leader, in morality, Christ emphasized self, or independency, in morality. While Moses established an aristocracy in morality, Christ established

a democracy. While the former recognized grades and degrees in men in their relation to morals, Christ recognized equality in such relations, as in those of politics. If there are any degrees according to his moral system it is in the morality, and not in the persons. A man may be more or less moral, but not more or less a man in relation to morals. Christ did not recognize one class of men for moral characters, or as having full moral faculties or attainments, as for example the priests as contradistinguished from the people, or the good as contradistinguished from the bad. He declared that whatever there is of moral attainments or knowledge is for all. There is nothing prescribed for the people that is not for the priests. Christ never asked his apostles or ministers to do this or that because they were ministers. The minister is nowhere in his teachings expected to be better than others, or others worse than he.

If Christ chose any particular persons to help him, or to engage particularly in moral propagation, it was in a purely ministerial capacity, as workmen, without any commission to lord it over others, or to exercise any authority which others did not have. He took for this purpose not priests or learned ecclesiastics, but laymen, tax gatherers, fishermen and artisans. His preachers were all

lay preachers, and their work as ministers was in no way inconsistent with their secular occupation.

He taught that morality is not religious, and not in any way connected with rites, ceremonies or ecclesiastical personages. It is a matter of every-day life, for every man, in every relation, with every one of his neighbors. It is a way of conducting one's self for practical purposes, a means of making one's self and his neighbors happy, and of making society and the world prosperous. It is as secular as sowing wheat, or making porcelain, and is not to be attended with a flourish of sacrifices or symbols. It is something that one can do without a priest, without a church, without a creed, and without even devotion; and it is not helped *per se* by any of these appliances any more than is the study of logarithms. Christ rescued morality from ecclesiastical trammels, and separated it in thought from the irrevelant matters of churchmanship.

9. From the National to the Cosmopolitan.

The next difference between the morality of Moses and that of Christ is that the former was national and the latter cosmopolitan. The former was calculated for the Jews, without regard to its

suitability to other people; and it has accordingl a narrowness and selfishness that altogether dis qualify it for a universal morality. The morality of Christ, on the other hand, is preëminently for all, giving no advantage to any class of men, and is as easily distinguishable from patriotism as it is from religion. The Ten Commandments were accordingly addressed to the Jews; the Sermon on the Mount to all the world. The Ten Commandments to one class of humanity; the Sermon on the Mount to all. The former was based on the requirements of a people at a particular time and place; the latter on human nature as permanent for all time and everywhere identical.

In giving the Mosaic morality God is represented as saying, "I am the Lord *thy* God, which brought *thee* (the Jews) out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage"—referring to a deliverance which was true only of the Jews. And in other utterances of the Old Testament God is the God of the Jews only, giving laws and conducting affairs for them and for no other people. He was as much the God of the Jews as Apollo w the God of the Trojans (in their ten years' wa and as much opposed to the Canaanites as Ju was opposed to the Greeks. He is "the God c Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob," "the God c

Israel," and the "God of our fathers." If he had cared for other peoples the Jews would have been as jealous as a modern wife would be if her husband should care for other women.

Under the Christian system, however, God is represented as the God of all the race, and having no preference for a Jew over a Greek; so that while Jewish theism was a religion as opposed to their gods (as its morality was largely to other peoples), Christ's was one as opposed to no god, or to atheism (as his morality was to no morality, or to immorality).

The reason or ground for moral conduct in the Jewish system was that the Jewish interests required it; in the Christian system it was that the interests of men require it.

While, therefore, Moses addressed himself to the Jews, Christ addressed himself to all. "Go ye," he says, "into all the world, and preach my gospel to every creature." He recognizes neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither master nor servant. It is whosoever believeth, whosoever will, whosoever doeth. God, in his system, is represented as no respecter of persons, "having made of one blood all men to dwell upon the face of the earth." He is set forth as desiring universal peace and good will to men.

"Think not to say within yourselves," he says to them, "'We have Abraham to our father'; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." The language of Christ is replete with "*alls*," "*whosoevers*," and "*everywheres*," never embracing less than mankind, and never one person less than another.

Reproving the narrowness of the Jews in these matters, Christ said: "And I say unto you that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness." And when he had startled them with the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and they asked him, "Who is my neighbor?" he related the parable of the good Samaritan, teaching them that all men are neighbors, and that men should be good to all men, as well as that foreigners and foreign enemies may be good no less than friends and co-patriots. The Jew and the Levite, he said, passed by on the other side, and he condemned them; the Samaritan showed mercy, and he approved him; showing that he preferred mercy to nationality, and practical aid to priestly sanctity. In this parable, Christ gave an extent to his morality as compre-

hensive as its quality was absolute. It was to embrace all, as well to embrace them in a love like that of one to himself. Love others as yourself, and love all as yourself, is its substance.

The Jews had felt and acted toward others differently according to their nation. Now they were to act toward all alike as toward men. Christ made man the basis of his morality; Moses made a Jew. Conduct under Christ's morality was to be regulated by no *to me*, or *to you*, or *to him;* but *to men*. The humanity in man, and not his relationship to the doer, was to be the approved motive to benevolence. It was not to be a sympathy toward ourselves, toward our family, toward our friends, toward our church, toward our nation, toward our age; but toward all mankind. The Jew loved his nation, the Pharisee his church, and the Greek his people. Christ loved all. His is the morality of the brotherhood of men, of the fraternity of the race, of the equality of peoples; a morality that makes men one, and gives them one interest—the universal good. He unnationalizes no one like the Jew, unchurches no one like the Pharisee, and ostracizes no one like the Greek. Neither "heathen," "heretic," nor "barbarian" was a word ever used by Christ in his moral teachings.

10. From the Provisional to the Permanent.

And finally another difference between the Mosaic morality and that of Christ is that the latter was in general corrective, complementary and revisory of the former, perfecting it wherein it was defective, and superseding it wherein it was hopelessly effete. Christ changed, in this, morality from the provisional to the permanent, and from the fragmentary to the universal. Rescuing it from expedience, and basing it on principle, he conformed it to a model that was ideal and a standard that was exceptionless. It was a sweeping reform and radical reconstruction—an entirely new codification of the moral law on an entirely new basis. Christ was in the fullest sense a revolutionist, and not one enchained by respect for things established. He was emphatically a man of progress, and wanted something better than could come out of the old. He did not profess to go according to the established law, but to repeal and re-enact it, and then to enforce it as thus revised. He was not an interpreter or expounder of the law, but a new law-giver. He did not make comments, like the scholiasts on Aristotle, but produced a new work, like Des Cartes or

Bacon, which was not to be reconciled with the old masters. He did not say, "Thus it is written," as did the Rabbins; but he gave his own opinion without authority. He spake as a legislator announcing new laws, and not as a judge deciding according to precedents. "He spake as one having authority, and not as the scribes." In the very face of the doctors he said, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, —— but I say unto you"— differently.

While, therefore, he recognized the Mosaic morality, it was as a master and not as a disciple. He took a broad survey of the whole subject of morals, in which the Mosaic law with other factors appeared; but he did not take its declarations as a creed limiting thought, but as a defective expression aiding it. The moral constitution of society, with the code that had been established by his people, was re-thought; and from this reconsideration he brought forth his new system, embodying in a more perfect form whatever was worth preserving of the old.

Thus he said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." And specifying his programme of emendations, he thus continues:

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill, and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say unto you that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire * * Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery. But I say unto you that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. * * It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife let him give her a writing of divorcement. But I say unto you that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is divorced committeth adultery. Again ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths. But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is his foot-stool; neither by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great king; neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your communication be yea, yea, and nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the

law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. * * Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you."

He gave the people to understand that the old morality was not sufficient for modern purposes, and that his was something more. After telling them that he came not to destroy anything in the law that was really of moral worth, but only to fill it up wherein it was defective, he says that not one jot or title shall pass, or even the least commandment be broken, under his system; and yet he adds that after all is done that is commanded in the law, one is not a moral man up to his standard. "For I say unto you that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees"—the most scrupulous observers of the law—"ye shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven." And then he specifies, as in the passages above quoted, in what the superiority of his morality consists, arguing that it is preferable for several reasons. Thus he says that by going to law you will go from court to court, and appeal to appeal, until

you finally land in prison; so that you had better yield the point, and give up your cloak, if need be, as well as your coat which is in dispute; that by swearing you cannot make one hair white or black; so that you might as well not swear at all; that by loving only those who love you, or narrowly saluting your brethren only, you do nothing above the commonest sinner; "for publicans do the same." He asks them, therefore, to extend their morality beyond the requirments of the old law, and be perfect even as their Father in heaven is perfect.

The law and the prophets, he tells them, were until John; and that then something more was added, when every one entered into the new kingdom of moral law. Moses, he says, permitted, in his morality, certain evils because of the hardness of their hearts or obtuseness of their early moral perceptions; but now such things are to be excluded by a higher moral standard. Accordingly when a young man asks what he must do, and Christ repeats the Ten Commandments, and he answers, "All these have I kept from my youth up," Jesus says, "Yet one thing thou lackest"; and advises him to do something more. And in commenting on the lack of the old law, which required merely reciprocity, he asks

the people to love sinners as well as good men, and enemies as well as friends; to do good to them that do evil, as well as to them that do good; to lend to those who will not repay, as well as to those who will; to give to such as ask, and from such as would borrow to turn not away; to give good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over; to forgive; to be merciful; to judge not; to condemn not; in short, to be perfect even as God is perfect. He asks them to make their wish of what others should do to them the measure of their conduct toward others, and not what others actually do; and to make the wants of men, rather than their merits, the measure of their conduct toward them.

When the woman taken in adultery was brought before Christ, and it was proven that, according to the Mosaic law, she should be stoned, he added more mercy to the law, and in the face of all precedent, dismissed her unpunished, telling her to sin no more. When the famishing apostles plucked the corn on the Sabbath and did eat, and it was alleged against them as a violation of the Mosaic law, Christ justified them in pity, and proclaimed their necessity to be controlled by a higher law. And when his friends or foes would take advantage of the Mosaic law to inflict

some sorrow, or not to mitigate it, he demanded charity of them by an extension of the law, and said that it was always lawful to do good, and not to do evil.

And so, in general, the morality of Christ, as compared with that of Moses, was a correcting, amplifying and perfecting of what was before inadequate, and an establishing of a more refined and elaborate morality to take the place of a more simple and primitive one.

Such, therefore, are the general differences between the morality of Moses and that of Christ, or between ancient, simple and unelaborated morality, as practiced in the homogeneous society of the infancy of our race, and the more mature, modern, and differentiated morality required in a more highly developed civilization.

Before passing to consider the next departure made by Christ in formulating his morality, let us observe several points in connection with the differences already mentioned between his morality and that of Moses.

And, first, Moses offered laws without allowances for violation, threatening penalties without mercy, and providing no line of retreat. Christ offered forgiveness for offenses, and deliverance from penalties. Moses wrote over the way to

transgression, "Abandon hope all ye who enter here"; Christ offered hope as a light shining in a dark place, and blotted out the *Lasciate speranza* and eternal responsibility which hung over the transgressor. His moralty contained a general jail delivery for sin.

The morality of Christ was given as to sinners; while that of Moses was given as to innocent parties. Christ's standard was so high that all must have offended; Moses' so low that all could be presumed guiltless. Under Christ's all-exacting morality there had to be forgiveness in order for benevolence; under Moses' looser system there could be no forgiveness, lest crime should be encouraged. Christ's object was to elevate sinners; Moses' to prevent crime.

Christ's morality was so high that the state needed not to enforce it for its peace, and hence admitted of toleration. Moses' was not a morality that admitted of religious liberty. Any violation of its provisions bordered on a violation of the civil law. The Christian morality was so high that the state could not take cognizance of it; its refined distinctions transcending the grosser realm of legal considerations. The opposite of Moses' morality is crime; of Christ's, sin. The state may judge of

the former, but not of the latter. There is no ground for religious intolerance under the Christian morality; or even for a connection between state and church. Religion is neither to be enforced nor prohibited by law. It flourishes best when let alone.

Under the Mosaic morality religion was an effort to reconcile God with man; under that of Christ it has rather been an effort to reconcile man with God Hence, under the former there were sacrifices and propitiatory ceremonies, and under the latter love, which, as Christ said, is better than burnt offerings. In the Mosaic religion God was the variable; in the Christian, man is the variable. The object under the former was to make God willing to do some good; under the latter, it is to make man willing. The former sought to regulate the conduct of Deity, the latter to regulate that of mankind. Ancient piety was accordingly a cause taken up against God; modern, a cause taken up against man. Men anciently stormed heaven; now they storm earth; so that whereas formerly there were more prayers, there is now more preaching. In brief, religion was formerly theological; now it is anthropological.

I have said that the Mosaic morality was ad-

dressed to one nation, and that it has the marks of the Jews and of the age upon it; while that of Christ was addressed to all men, and to all times, without historic or geographic features upon it. Moses' morality was also addressed to one class of society,—to the property owners, and the free citizens; while the morality of Christ was addressed to all. The former addressed itself to the master or employer when it wished to command the servant or inferior. "Thou shalt not do any work, thou, *nor thy son*, nor *thy daughter*, nor thy *man servant*, nor thy *maid servant*, nor the *stranger that is within thy gates;* thus charging one class with the duty and responsibility of another—the parent with the child's, the master with the slave's, and the host with the guest's. Christ spoke directly to the inferiors themselves; to the singular, to the individual, to the personal. The morality of Moses, likewise, charged the men with the duty of the women: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, * * nor his maid servant." "Thou shalt not approach unto a woman * * as long as she is put apart for her uncleanness." "Thou shalt not (speaking of women) cause the land to sin." Christ, on the other hand, said more directly, "*thou*," and spake to woman as he spake to man, and considered her

state in religion as well as his, and in general proclaimed her equality with man, as he did that of employes and servants with their superiors.

So much for the first general characteristic of the morality of Christ, or its departure from the Mosaic morality. I shall treat in the next chapter of its second great distinctive feature, or its departure from the Pharisaic morality.

CHAPTER II.

DEPARTURE FROM THE PHARISAIC MORALITY.

CHAPTER II.

DEPARTURE FROM THE PHARISAIC MORALITY.

1. From Ceremonies to Practical Virtues.

The second great departure made by Christ in establishing his morality was from the Pharisees. The Pharisees were the ritualists or sacramentarians of their times. They had, in the practice of their religion, gone off from morality into ceremonies, symbols, and other indirect and incidental matters of form and mechanicals, and relied on the mystic influence of rites for virtue. Christ wished, accordingly, to recall them to the proper subjects of morality,—to justice, truth, kindness, and the like. He waged a war of great relentlessness against them, and illustrated his teachings by the sharpest contrasts with theirs. In denouncing them he often lost his patience, and indulged in invectives, as he did in no other case. He had some charity for sinners, but none for pretentious religionists, feeling toward the latter much as the Red Republicans of France feel toward priests

and priestly pretensions to-day. As the Pharisees rejected him with ecclesiastical disdain, and unchurched those who followed him, so he rejected them, and cautioned his followers against them; denounced their practices as irrelevant to morality, and said that unless men's righteousness should exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, they should in no case enter the kingdom of heaven. No words were too bitter for him to use against them, no charges too severe for him to make. They were a "generation of vipers," "whited sepulchres full of dead men's bones," "hidden graves," over which men walked unconscious, "hypocrites," "devourers of widows' houses," and whatever else was bad. "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," he said, in denouncing the several peculiarities of this class —sanctimoniousness, proselytism, exclusiveness, formalism, externalism, ceremonialism, sacramentarianism, and others which we shall discuss in this chapter,—the array being the most severe indictment ever made against this form of religion:

"Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" he said, "for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves. Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven

against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, Whosoever shall swear by the temple it is nothing, but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple he is a debtor. Ye fools and blind! * * Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithes of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, faith. * * Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel! Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter that the outside of them may be clean also. Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness. Even so ye outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore, ye be witnesses unto yourselves that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up, then, the measures of your fathers, ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! How shall ye escape the damnation of hell?"

And again:

"The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; * * but do not ye after their works; for they say and do not. For they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers. But all their works they do to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, and love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogue, and greetings in the market, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi."

In short, Christ denounced the Pharisees without moderation, and warned his disciples against their practices with a vehemence that can be explained only on the ground they were the chief obstacle to his success as he was to theirs.

The vice of Pharisaic morality, and that feature in particular against which Jesus took issue, was that it was artificial instead of natural, and conventional instead of spontaneous, consisting in formal practices, either indifferent in themselves and adjudged to be right by some arbitrary distinction, or else trivial in themselves and adjudged to be important by some mystic influence. It was a morality that consisted largely in the observance of postures, the making of signs, the washing of pots, the keeping of days, the manipulation of sacred things and other matters that have no con-

nection whatever with morality. Christ accordingly sought to call the people away from such matters to the proper subjects of morality—to good will, honesty, purity, and the like, as suggested by common sense and practical reason. The second great object of Christ's moral system, therefore, was to get men to the useful and substantial subjects of morality, instead of the indifferent and fanciful ones, and to emphasize them in their due importance.

In the first place, then, with this view he sought to turn the people away from ceremonies, as being the most common refuge of trivial morality. Ceremonies were to him but the mechanical movements and forces which they represent as physical phenomena—an equivalent of just so much expenditure of muscle and bodily juices. He accordingly would have none of them in his morality, and he dissuaded the people from them as mere trifles, saying that such as practiced ceremonies worshiped God with their lips, while their hearts were far from him. He participated in no ceremonies himself and prescribed none for others. On the contrary, he shocked the churchly with his non-conformity, and when he summed up the whole of the Law and the Prophets (and so set forth the whole duty of morality and religion) he

left out ceremonies altogether, saying in answer to the question of the Pharisees ("Master, which is the great commandment of the law?"), "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment, and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments (practical) hang all the law and the prophets (ceremonial)." There was never such a poor churchman as Christ. His prayers were short, his forms were simple, his devotions were infrequent. He had no regularity or uniformity of religious conduct. He gave no creed, no litany, and no church polity. He was simply natural and independent, without anything ecclesiastical or liturgical about him, and he taught others to be so, too. With philosophical discrimination he perceived that there is nothing moral in ceremonies—nothing like justice, patience or love; that they feed no hungry, clothe no naked, build no cities, produce no works of art, discover no truths, and, in short, do nothing of any advantage to anybody whatever. Accordingly he represents God as saying: "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice"; and he approves the observation of the scribe who said, "Well, Master, thou hast said the truth. To love God with all the heart, and with

all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices." For we are told that "when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." And he likewise approved the answer of Zaccheus, who was charged by the Pharisees with being a sinner, because of his non-conformity to their churchly rites: "And Zaccheus stood and said unto the Lord: 'Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation I restore him fourfold.' And Jesus said unto him, 'This day is salvation come to this house, for as much as he also is a son of Abraham.'"

Christ put himself squarely on a platform of common sense in morality, and tried to make men as rational in religion as in other matters. He would have nothing like crossing fingers, shaving heads, drawling tones, or using particular food or dress to enter into his system. He complained of all this in the Pharisees, saying that "they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments," and do other useless things for virtue—washing their hands, eating sacred things, and eschewing "unclean" meats and

persons. All this he called simple foolishness, as also the characterizing of indifferent words and actions by arbitrary distinctions, and calling one kind right and another wrong, and the defining of the mere manner of conduct, and calling one way good and another bad. For the Pharisees aimed more at good ways than at good deeds (just as in their opposition they resisted wrong ways rather than wrongs), while Christ always kept to the substance of conduct, and offended the Pharisees by his neglect of its forms. The Pharisees had a right way and a wrong way for everything; and morality among them was more in keeping the difference than in doing either; having a right way even of doing wrong, and wrong ways of doing right. The Pharisees were in morals what the Sophists were in philosophy; and Christ treated them as Socrates did the latter, his principal reform being a substitution of the substance for the formal distinctions and practices of morality.

In general, therefore, we say, Christ made it a prominent object of his moral teaching to lead the people away from ceremonies to practical virtues.

2. From Sacramentarianism to Common Sense.

In the next place, he sought to disabuse the minds of the people of the conceit that there is any virtue in ceremonies and rites, as such, or that there is any power of a mystic or magic character in them. For the next most silly thing after supposing such practice to be moral in itself, is to suppose that it effects moral results; as changing one's nature, or taking away his sins. Christ had no patience with such pretensions, but called all advocates of them "fools," or something similar. There was nothing sacramentarian about Jesus, just as there was nothing liturgical about him. He had no holy objects, no dedicated persons or places, nothing that was made good or bad by such irrelevant processes as saying words or making signs over them. He taught that moral, like other results, must be effected by dynamic equivalents—in this case by states of mind and benevolent actions, and not by trivial motions of the body or limbs. The severest words he ever uttered were spoken in condemnation of such things.

Especially did Christ insist that moral worth was not to be unconsciously imparted through the

skin or stomach by the laying on of hands, the sprinkling of water, the eating of sacred things, or other irrelevant or inadequate causes. All such applications he considered as but old wives' cures in theology, on a par with the charms and magical appliances of the medical world. He ridiculed the alleged effect of clean and unclean food on morals (other than the ordinary effect on digestion), saying, with contemptuous irreverence for such things, that "whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man * * entereth not into his heart, but into his belly, and goeth out into the draught." He ridiculed, in like manner, the Pharisees for washing their hands and cleansing their pots in the hope of effecting moral results thereby. He claimed that his was not a cutaneous or gastric morality, making men good through the capillaries or bowels. He encouraged no such thought as that persons might be made virtuous by physiological processes, or by the application of machinery; or that goodness could in any way be imparted through extraneous mediums. He had no patience with sacramentarian pretensions of any kind, or with the men who made them. With all others he argued, but with such he said he could not argue. He simply called them fools, and said they sinned against the Holy Ghost, or

common-sense certainties. He could not endure men who argued in a realm where all tests fail, and where, since you can have no proof for or against a proposition, one can assert anything with impunity, and hold out against all the senses and reason—the common refuge of errors, which defy science and common sense alike, and where fools are more apt to prevail than wise men. Christ's clear, practical mind, therefore, had an impatient contempt for such persons, and he never failed to use caustive invectives against them, alleging that, like hopeless idiots, there was no cure for them.

Instead of such irrational and unscientific assumptions, Jesus taught the conscious and cognizable processes and effects of morality; states of mind such as any one may know, and not unconscious proceedings that cannot be detected; states like joy, peace, love and charity, that come primarily into consciousness in their exercise; and not churchly effects wrought, like those of medicine or poison, by secret processes unperceived in the system. He emphasized the fact that observable qualities constitute Christianity, not unconscious graces conditioned upon ceremonies. Christ's was emphatically a conscious religion, supported by experience, and appealing to common sense

and philosophy, and not to superstitious ghost-craft or magic.

Jesus taught the direct contact of moral forces with man, and not their operation through indirect and unnatural channels and mediums; and he claimed that whatever influence comes from God comes to man direct and not through rites, sacraments, or the like; just as he taught also the immediate contact of man with duty; or that duty is to be performed directly out of one's mind and hand, and not through a medium of ceremonies; and in general he taught that morality is performable by man without any instruments, and in particular without any instruments of ecclesiastical fabrication. It was the doctrine of the individual in morality, and of the personal immediate in conduct.

The Pharisees had, in their use of ceremonies, got all the instruments and places sacred, until the channels through which they thought virtue was imparted to man seemed more important than the man himself; for in such estimation did they hold the temple, the altar, the shew bread, and the "sacred" utensils, that they forgot the object of their religion in the means. Christ taught them not to put sanctity in other objects than themselves. Men only are sacred in his estimation;

not churches, rites, days or the implements which they use. He evidently considered it heathenish to count wood and stone holy, or to make motion or space an element of morality.

3. From Trivial Distinctions to Real Differences.

In the next place Christ wished to draw off the minds of the people from the unimportant distinctions which the Pharisees made. It has always been the reproach of religion, in most of its forms, to fight over little things; and the Pharisees, the most churchly of churches, were prominent in these low-begotten quarrels. They had been making such distintions as between swearing by the temple and swearing by the gold in the temple, saying that the former is nothing, and that the latter makes one a debtor; between swearing by the altar and swearing by the gift on the altar, saying that the former is nothing, and that the latter is guilty; between cursing one's father and saying to him, "it is a gift by whatsoever thou mayest be profited by me"; saying that the former is deserving of death, and the other of no penalty whatever; in all of which matters when they appealed to Christ he called them a set of fools,

and said there was no sense in their distinctions. Arguing with them from their own standpoint, he said: "Ye fools and blind; for whether is greater, the gold or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? Ye fools and blind! whether is greater, the gift or the altar which sanctifieth the gift?" etc. So they made distinctions between saying "Raca," and saying "thou fool"; between worshiping at Jerusalem, and worshiping in the mountains of Samaria; between washing hands before eating, and eating with unwashen hands; between the washing of cups, pots, brazen vessels and tablets, and the omission of such ablutions; differences similar, we may add, to those now made by the successors of the Pharisees; as between taking the sacrament with a glove or without one, between turning to the east or the west in certain devotions, between consecrated and unconsecrated places and things (as days, churches, bread and persons), between immersion and sprinkling, between baptized and unbaptized persons, etc., etc.

Now touching all such matters Christ expressed his supreme contempt, and, after calling the Pharisees fools again—his favorite appellation for that class—he reproved them for omitting weightier matters of morality for such tradi-

tional distinctions. Thus, touching their distinctions in regard to washing, we are told that

"There came together unto him the Pharisees and certain of the Scribes which came from Jerusalem, and when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashen hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market except they wash they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels, and of tablets. Then the Pharisees and Scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you, hypocrites, as it is written, 'This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.' Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups; and many other such things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition, * * making the word of God of none effect through your traditions, which ye have delivered; and many such like things ye do. * * But rather," he advises them, "give alms of such things as ye have."

He not only reproves the Pharisees for giving

importance to such trivial distinctions, but he himself on one occasion, when he dined with a Pharisee, sat down without washing, and, in utter contempt of their churchly rites, defended it. "For," we are told, "when the Pharisees saw it, and marveled that he had not washed his hands before dinner, he said, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. Ye fools, did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also? But rather give alms of such things as ye have, and all things are clean unto you. But woe unto you Pharisees; for ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God."

So, also, touching the distinctions of the Pharisees in eating and drinking, or eating one thing rather than another, or at one time rather than another, Christ showed like contempt. He did not keep their fasts or feasts, or observe any regulations whatever in such matters; nor did he ask others to do so; but when the Pharisees charged him and his disciples with neglecting them he defended such neglect as being of no moral consequence. For we are told, "there came to him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and

the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them?" thus making laws of eating and drinking of his own, to suit health and pleasure, and not traditional religious distinctions. And so when "he went through the cornfields on the Sabbath day and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn, and the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the Sabbath day that which is not lawful?" he said unto them, "Have ye not read what David did when he had need and was an hungered, he and they that were with him? how he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar, the high priest, and did eat the shew bread, which it is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them that were with him?" thus defending his own irregular conduct and even justifying a more extreme case. He not only did not fast, but he committed sacrilege with their petty sacred things, and justified David in doing so in the most aggravating way. In fact, Christ was frequently accused of sacrilege, and even blasphemy, such being a common charge made by sacramentarians against free and independent men, seeing that they have so many trivial distinctions which a

practical or philosophic thinker is apt to disregard.

So with their distinctions about the proper dress and demeanor for fasting and worship—their sack-cloth and ashes, their disfiguration of their faces, and the like. Jesus characterized all such distinctions as mere nonsense, and said that men should in all things preserve a natural and modest demeanor as being most appropriate for morality. "When ye fast," he said, "be not as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance; for they disfigure their faces that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you they have their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head and wash thy face, that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly"; as much as to say that one's ordinary dress is as good for religious purposes as any other, whether sack-cloth or silk gowns; and that a clean face and well oiled hair are as good as a disfiguration of ashes and dishevelment. Christ had no ecclesiastical dress, demeanor or symbols,—no robes, surplices or altar clothes, no candles, censers or acolytes. He saw no connection between such things and morality; but denounced them and those who used

them as off the subject altogether. He went about in his ordinary dress; eating and drinking with moral indifference; sitting down with Pharisees and sinners; unmindful of days and "proprieties"; provoking the remark from the Pharisees, "He doth not do this," and "He doth not do that" "according to the law," and giving the response to all such cavilers, "Ye fools and blind!"

So touching the distinctions of the Pharisees about the Sabbath, in which they were as punctilious as in other matters, he showed a like indifference. Recognizing the substantial uses and purposes of the day, he did not further regard it at all, or consider it as at all relevant to morals. When the Pharisees found fault that he healed on the Sabbath, he said, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath-day, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill?" And when they found fault that his disciples plucked the corn and ate it on the Sabbath, he defended them and all like formal and technical violators, whose violation does not entail any practical evil. Referring to David's and similar profanations of sacred things, which were harmless, he asked them whether they had "not read in the law how the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath and are blameless?" He also told them that "the Sabbath was made for man,

and not man for the Sabbath"; and that he had himself the disposition of his moral seasons and places, as every man of common sense has, he being lord also of the Sabbath, and judge of his duty.

So with the distinctions of the Pharisees in regard to sacred places, or consecrated spots, buildings, and like objects. He recognized no relevancy whatever of such things to morals; and in his teachings he sought to draw the people away from their consideration. Accordingly, when the woman of Samaria wished to get his opinion on such a quibble as the right place in which to worship, saying, "Our fathers worshiped in this mountain, and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship," he said, "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet in Jerusalem worship the Father. * * But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." His was not a morality that took cognizance of mountains or cities, or was in any way affected by circumstances, and he did not consider the differences in such matters as of any consequence.

And so, in general, Christ wished, in his moral teachings, to draw off the minds of the people from the unimportant distinctions of the Pharisees. He never answered their trivial questions; but either told them they were too unimportant for consideration, or called them a set of fools, and asked them impatiently not to try him with such matters. He made no account of religious titles or positions, such as the Pharisees delighted in, or of the differences between them; as between priests and laity, between sacred men and others, between holy orders and secular callings, or between communicants and sinners. He reproved the Pharisees' fondness for being called "Rabbi," and for the distinctions which they received as religious men or teachers; and he told his followers not to be called Rabbi, or Master, or by any other title, and not to call anybody else by such titles; not, it would seem, by "Reverend," "Right Reverend," "Most Reverend," "Reverend Reverend," or anything of the kind. All such distinctions in his view not only lie outside of morals, but contravene the democratic equality which he would enforce; and the differences, instead of being proper subjects of moral thought, should never have found their way into religion at all.

4. From Circumstantials to Substantials.

The next point on which Christ took issue in his departure from the Pharisees, was, their abandonment of important for less important things, and the elevation of minor and non-essential matters to great prominence. It is one of the vices of religious systems generally, and particularly of the Pharisaic forms of religion, to neglect substantials for circumstantials, substances for forms, meanings for words, actions for ways, ends for means, devotions for ceremonies, and in general, morality for its appearance. Hence the greatest battles of the church have been fought, not about whether licentiousness or drunkenness should be arrested, or whether wars should be ended, or nations or civilization advanced, or great truths promulgated; but about whether one should be put under water or have the water put upon him; about how bread and wine should be taken in the eucharist; about what became of the virgin Mary's body; about whether you should say "Vater Unser" or "Unser Vater" in the Lord's Prayer; about the form of church government; about variations from prescribed ritual, and about other matters which very slightly or very remotely affect morality.

Christ wished to leave no place for such dispositions in his system, and he consequently denounced them in the Pharisees. "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" he says, "for ye pay tithes of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith; these ought ye to have done, and not leave the other undone." "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and" —— kill the prophets. For * * "behold I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues and persecute them from city to city." "Woe unto you Pharisees," he says, "for ye tithe all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God. Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye * * for a pretense make long prayers, and * * devour widows' houses." "Ye fools and blind!" "Ye blind guides which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel!"

On the other hand he taught that the duty of man is to attend to the important things first and chiefly, and if this cannot be done without neglecting the others, to neglect the minor matters

rather; and at all events to hold mere formal and conventional regulations as non-essentials. "Do this," he says, speaking of the more important things, "and ye shall live." He, accordingly, approves the views and conduct of those who compass these greater matters, whatever may be their short-comings in the minor, or their neglect of the formal; as in commending the answer of the Scribe, who said, "To love God with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices"; and the answer of Zaccheus, just given, who, though a sinner according to the distinctions of the church, said, "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation I restore him fourfold." For Jesus approved both of these persons; saying of the first that "he answered discreetly," and of the second that "this day is salvation come to this house." He emphasized the fact that a man with such views and practices as these cannot be substantially wrong whatever may be his views or practices in the circumstantial matters of religion and morality. When Christ was asked what one must do to be saved, he repeated, not any of

the differentials of Christians, but the substantial commandments; and when asked what is the greatest commandment, he said, "To love God"; and he added that the rest was like it—"To love thy neighbor." "Do this," he said, "and ye shall live."

In particular did Jesus condemn in the Pharisees their neglect of internal for external matters of morality, and their too great concern for the appearances which manifest themselves to the observer, and which are generally accompanied by a corresponding neglect of internal and substantial virtue. In no respect did he show as great antipathy as he manifested toward the prominence given by the Pharisees to the externals of morality.

"Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" he says, "for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and

iniquity. * * Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Or, according to another Gospel, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men that walk over them are not aware of them." And again, "Ye hypocrites! well did Esaias prophecy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth and honoreth me with their lips, and their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." He elsewhere says, addressing the multitude in regard to them, "All their works they do for to be seen of men. They make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, and love the uppermost rooms of feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogue, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi." He reproved them, as we have seen, for so dressing and demeaning themselves that they shall seem outwardly to fast, and for praying so that they may be seen of men, as well as for all other practices which are not the natural outgrowth and expression of the inward state of mind, saying, "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good, and an evil man out of the evil treasure of

his heart bringeth forth that which is evil; for of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh"; and to take on the appearance of goodness or devotion he despised as being the essence of hypocrisy as well as of stupidity. He therefore wished none of this outward display, but wanted men to take care of morality, and let the appearances take care of themselves. He asked them to keep the heart right as the substance of moral worth, rather than to keep their pots and their hands washed in ceremonial punctiliousness. "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: these are the things which defile a man; but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man," and, on the other hand, he admonished them that to have love and do what is useful is good, and not to make a show of forms and devout appearances.

In short, Christ laid all stress, in his controversy with the Pharisees, on the important, internal, and essential matters of duty, and condemned the Pharisees for not doing so. He dealt with the man,—the mind, the heart and the substantial act. The Pharisees dealt with his eating, washing and manner of praying, saying that these latter constitute what one ought to do in religion.

Jesus, in great contempt of this notion says that they have no understanding; that they ought to know touching eating, for example, that "whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught," and that, as for washing hands, it has no other effect than to clean them, which is not a moral but a physiological effect, and its omission in religion is neither defiling nor otherwise important. Christ wanted to make it understood, which is a hard thing to understand in religion, that things have their importance according to a common-sense standard, and that one is wise or foolish according as he observes or does not observe things in proportion to their real importance.

5. From Tradition to Experience.

Another matter which Christ condemned in the Pharisees, and in which he took issue with them, was their veneration for tradition, and their tendency to follow what was old, or what their fathers or predecessors had done, however it might be unsuited or inadequate to the present time. They went in beaten tracks with little thought of their own; following authority rather than insight, and the church rather than reason. This has always

been the characteristic of people and churches who have been addicted to ceremonies, forms, and other littlenesses in religion; because all such customs to have authority now, must have originated afar back, where the present generation cannot detect the ridiculousness of their origin, and so may be supposed to have other reasons for their existence than the present can furnish. For if men should propose such practices now, or recommend them on rational grounds, they would be decried as wanting in good sense. Accordingly, we say, formalism, sacramentarianism, and Pharisaism generally are received traditionally and on authority; and the earlier they originated, and the greater the darkness which enshrouds their origin, the more successful they are. The Pharisees accordingly followed tradition in their practices; and had the usual corruptions and perversions that are to be found in traditional systems,—corruptions of simpler and more rational practices of earlier times; and, as is universal in such cases, the precedents of the church were given as their sufficient warrant.

Christ attacks this spirit and tendency without mercy, having no sympathy with either their practices or their way of defending them. Accordingly when the scribes and Pharisees approached

him touching his lack of conformity to their practices, saying, "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread," he answered and said unto them, "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition," adding that in following such tradition they neglect more important concerns. "For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother, and He that curseth father or mother let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, it is a gift by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; and honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition." And again, "For laying aside the commandment of God ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups; and many other such things ye do. And he said unto them, Full well ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition." And again he says that like their predecessors in the time of Elias, who pretended to be teaching the words of God, they are engaged in "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." He also says that the same men whose names and authority they are reverencing because of

their antiquity, they would kill if they caught them now; just as their fathers had done, just as they were doing then, and just as he prophesied their successors would do in the future.

"Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," he says, "because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers we would not have been partakers with them in the blood of the prophets. Wherefore be ye witnesses unto yourselves that ye are the children of them which kill the prophets. Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents! ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell? Wherefore, behold! I send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city; that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar."

Christ's conflict with the Pharisees was with people of another age, who saw sacred things only in the past, and would illuminate the religious present not with its own common-sense light, but with the dim religious light brought down from antiquity — old tallow-candles instead of to-day's sun. He wished to get men to think

of religion in the terms and experiences of the present, catching the spirit of the age as they advance, and living up with their duties which wait not for an illumination adown the ages. "Can ye not," he says, "discern the signs of the times?" Pharisees, like Bourbons, never forget anything, and never learn anything; while Reformers, like Christ, have always to combat the prejudices of hundreds of years summed up in fossilized institutions and antiquarians. The first will never give up the old, or permit a radical change; and the latter can never adjust the present to the past, and so escape the charge of being revolutionists. Christ accordingly said, touching such matters, and in answer to the charge of radicalness, "No man putteth a piece of new cloth on to an old garment; for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment and the rent is made worse. Neither do men put new wine into old bottles, else the bottles break and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish; but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved." He characterized the old systems as past renovation, being, like themselves, rotten and effete, sepulchres full of dead men's bones, monuments over a once living past.

The Pharisees proceeded, as I have said, on authority, and required precedent for every step. They were constantly asking, "By what authority doest thou these things?" much like the questions put by Pharisees now, who demand ecclesiastical authority of every one who tries to do good. Christ taking issue with them on this point, never asked for and never gave authorities; unless it was, like Socrates among the Sophists, to catch them in their own nets, and show them how ridiculous they were. But he gave precepts which his own reason suggested, and not inferences which were interpreted from precedent; and he appealed to men's practical judgment for their confirmation, rather than to the Scriptures. "He spake," says the Evangelist, "as one having authority, and not as the Scribes." He ignored the authorities in dealing with the woman taken in adultery, much to the horror of the Pharisees who wanted to religiously kill her "according to the Scriptures." And when the Pharisees charged him with doing this and doing that against the Law and the Prophets, he not only justified his departure, but condemned their slavish adherence to precedent. People who have very foolish practices dare not rely on their reason, or they would soon abandon them. Such accordingly

accept authority. They lay the folly on some past age or person. Formerly it was Moses; now, alas! it is Christ. Anything that is too silly for man to propose is charged on God.

6. From Exclusiveness to Charity.

The next characteristic of the Pharisees to which Christ took exception was their exclusiveness, or intolerance of any other system or moral agency than their own. Christ recognized and encouraged well-doing everywhere, and by every person, under whatever circumstances of irregularity or independence. The Pharisees, however, and, in fact, all "churchly" people, have, as a rule, been jealous of anybody else doing good but themselves, as if they had a monopoly of morality, and exercised it as an exclusive right; being intolerant of others' efforts as an infringment. In their warfare against sin they have generally hated those who were doing good more than those who were doing evil, and turned their batteries, as good men, against their own ranks rather than against their enemies. Nothing more incenses a pronounced "churchman" than to do like him—a secret admission that he is doing something foolish. Such persons have always

been more impatient of saints outside of their ranks, than of sinners within them; hating other churches more than "the world," and outsiders chiefly because they are in other churches, heresy being ever considered a greater offense than sin, and non-conformity than either.

Christ, accordingly, drew a clear line of separation between such uncharitableness and what he would inculcate; condemning the former in the most unqualified terms, and inculcating the idea of liberality and fraternal recognition of all well-doers. He did not consider that religion was likely to be spoiled by being practiced, or that one could not attend to it without license, or had to practice it only in specified ways and in fixed ecclesiastical relations. He wanted men to enter freely into it, and to have it popular instead of reserved to a few, and lay instead of clerical. While the Pharisees seemed to say to everybody, Beware of doing good, lest you should not do it right; Christ said to all, Do good; and thought they could not be as far wrong, however they might do it, as in doing evil. The Pharisees did not want any "doing good" in the world that they were not managing, and the appearance of new systems and new religions was met with more uncharitableness than of new vices; just

as this class now discourage all moral agencies outside of the church; such as temperance and secret societies, young mens' Christian associations, union revival meetings and unsectarian benevolences generally.

Christ condemned, therefore, such bigotry and bigots. "Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," he said; "for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in." He also reproved his own followers whenever they showed any of this spirit; for it is now quite well established that Christians can be Pharisees as well as Jews. Thus, as the Evangelist relates, "And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followed not us; and we forbade him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not; for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part." And then he adds, drawing all would-be Christians and Christian sympathizers within his approval, whether connected with him in religious organization or not, and whether following his methods or not, and whether having the same beliefs or not, "For whosoever shall give you a cup of water to

drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you he shall not lose his reward." A willingness to do right is enough to make one a Christian; and the doing of it to the best of his ability was always deemed by Christ sufficient.

The Pharisees did not admit Jesus to fellowship with them, or recognize him as a co-worker in morals. But even when they could not deny his good works, they denied the legitimacy of his methods, and so condemned his conduct as irregular and schismatic. Christ condemned, therefore, in turn, their prejudice, and taught them the essential unity and oneness of the moral cause, however different the agencies; therein reversing the position of the Pharisees or High Churchmen, who insist on the oneness of the church, or agency, whatever the number of the causes may be. Thus the Evangelist relates it:

"But when the Pharisees heard it (that he cast out devils) they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand. And if Satan cast out Satan he is divided against himself; how shall, then, his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? Therefore, they shall be

your judges. But if I cast out devils by the spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else, how can one enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house. He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad."

And then follows the most severe utterance ever made by Christ, the effect of which is that there is no manner of excuse, and therefore no ground for pardon, either here or hereafter, for the prejudice of the bigots, who, when they see with their own eyes, and have all evidence possible, of the good done by others, yet denounce it as bad because not done by themselves or in connection with their church: "Wherefore, I say unto you," he says, "all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." It is a lie in the face of truth, a sin, not against any person or opinion, but against truth itself and one's own recognition of it. For with this spirit one cannot fairly be convinced of anything, but must take his opinion from his desires—a fault that is incurable if one's feelings are uncharitable; for if one's own sight will not convince him, nor all possible evidence, he is desperate beyond intellectual or moral recov-

ery. Christ therefore continues: "And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of Man it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come"; herein teaching that one may discredit and reject Christ and be forgiven, but not if he knowingly decide against the evidence, or hold out against his convictions. Whereupon he proceeds to teach that in religion, as in everything else, we must judge agencies by their results; saying that that is a good tree which brings forth good fruit, and that a corrupt tree which brings forth corrupt fruit; insinuating that even the Pharisees, or boasted legitimate church and religion, is not a good one because not bringing forth good fruits: "for the tree is known by his fruits." Therefore he says: "O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."

At another time speaking of this prejudice, which was the principal obstacle to his success, he said, after using all his arguments in vain to recommend his cause, "But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the markets, and calling unto their fellows, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced;

we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented. For John came neither eating nor drinking; and they say he hath a devil. The son of man came eating and drinking; and they say, Behold a man gluttonous and a wine bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners"; as much as to say that they will be convinced by neither one kind of proof nor another. And then, as the Evangelist tells us, "he began to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done," as if he thought that when argument cannot affect a people, one has no other resort than to call them fools and threaten some calamity to work on their fears. "Woe unto thee Chorazin! woe unto thee Bethsaida! for if the mighty works which were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of Judgment than for you. And thou Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell; for if the mighty works which have been done in thee had been done in Sodom it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of Judgment than for thee."

Christ disapproved also of all such pretensions of the Pharisees as that they had the only authority in religion—that they did, for example, the only legitimate work; that they were the only good people; that outsiders were necessarily bad; and that they were all the worse for trying to be good. His views on the subject are thus recorded by the Evangelist Luke:

"And he spake this parable unto certain which boasted in themselves that they were righteous and despised others. Two men went up unto the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself: God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week; I give tithes of all that I possess. And the publican standing afar off would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast saying, God be merciful to me a sinner. I tell you this man went down to his house justified rather than the other; for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

Christ despised all exclusive claims of goodness, as he did of legitimacy. The pretentious man was to him an object of suspicion, and he told his disciples to beware of him. "Ye are they," he says, contemptuously, to this class, "which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth

your heart; for that which is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of God." And he approves the straightforward sinner who, making no pretensions to goodness, admits his real errors, rather than the pretentious man or class, who claim to be exceptionally good and are not. "But what think ye?" he says, "A certain man had two sons, and he came to the first and said, Son, go work to-day in my vineyard. He answered and said, I will not; but afterward he repented and went. And he came to the second and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir; and went not. Whether of them twain did the will of his father? And they say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before you." In the parable of the good Samaritan, he says that the priest and the Levite passed by the unfortunate man on the other side, while the heretical Samaritan bound up his wounds and took him to an inn; thus justifying the irreligious alien in his charity, rather than the most sacred characters of the Jews in their exclusiveness.

Thus, therefore, in general, did Christ take exception to the exclusiveness and pretentious superiority of the Pharisees, and inculcated an

humble and all-inclusive charitableness instead. He spake as to all men, and gave a morality suitable to all men, irrespective of race, culture, creed, or personal characteristics. His was a work which was not to stop at any man because of his belief, or because of his relation to any existing or future organization. In its pursuit no class was authorized to exclude any other. He gave a morality for which one needed no license to practice, no restraints to check, no leadership to pursue.

7. From Proselytism to Fraternization.

The final characteristic of the Pharisees which Christ condemned was their proselytism. Men are always inclined to proselyte when they have foolish systems for the success of which they cannot depend on reason, or opinions for the defense of which they cannot trust to the natural force of truth. Not being able to convince men in the usual and legitimate way, they try to persuade them without conviction; getting them to abandon their reason for authority, tradition, or something else which they do not understand. They try not so much to lead men to any course of morality or practical amelioration, but to induce

them to enter their church for the sake of swelling its numbers, or adding to its pretensions. All exclusive persons run to proselyting, not so much because they think they are pursuing the right way, and because, therefore, it is to the interest of all men to pursue it likewise, but because, since this conviction of their rightfulness is not well-grounded and sincere, they are interested in making it appear so for effect, and in having it so recognized by its success. For, with all their pretensions, bigots are timorous and anxious, and so are not only proselyting but intolerant. They proselyte and persecute, not because they are afraid of the fate of men, but of that of the church, their conduct being, after all, not founded on a conviction, but on a doubt.

But whatever may be the cause, Pharisees have always proselyted, and Christ specialized it as a vice in them to be condemned and avoided; just as liberal moralists do to-day, who make the proselyting of exclusive sects their target for satire. Thus Jesus says, "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves." And thus he further reproves such as are ever interfering with others' morality, mak-

ing raids on good men rather than on bad men, and condemning them *ex cathedra* on churchly grounds: "Judge not that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again. And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and behold, a beam is in thine own eye. Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." The Pharisees have always sought to replenish their church out of other churches, rather than from "the world," and to make saints out of good people by very little changes, rather than out of bad ones by great changes—taking out invisible motes and setting men to washing pots instead of "doing righteousness." "Ye are they," says Christ, "which justify yourselves before men." The church, or organization, is all-important to Pharisees; their church is the only church, and they want all mankind in its fold; and Christ is witness that in his time they made men worse when they got them in than they were before, and even worse than themselves; for a pros-

elyte becomes the extremest of bigots—"two-fold more than the child of hell," as Christ says, than those who proselyte him.

Such, therefore, is the issue which Jesus took with the Pharisees, and such the departure from their morality which characterizes his own. The Pharisees were his bitterest foes, and to all their petty pretensions and exclusive features he set his morality in unmistakable contrast. It is not to be alleged against Christ's morality that Pharisees under other names are now washing their pots in his name. He fought the Pharisees while he lived, and if they have since flanked him, and taken in great part the church itself, it is none the less true that such was his morality, however men may have departed from it since.

CHAPTER III.

DEPARTURE FROM THE GRÆCO-ROMAN MORALITY.

CHAPTER III.

DEPARTURE FROM THE GRÆCO-ROMAN MORALITY.

1. From the Interest of the Fortunate to that of the Unfortunate.

(*a*) *From the Rich to the Poor.*

I shall speak next of Christ's departure from the Græco-Roman morality, or the third great distinctive feature of his system.

In making this departure Christ wished to substitute the submissive or non-resistant character and conduct for the self-asserting and heroic. The Greeks were brave, bold, and daring; and the hardy virtues were esteemed among them. Their moral men were the war-like, athletic and vigorous, both in body and mind. The conqueror was their highest type of moral excellence, and glory, victory, triumphs and crowns were his appropriate moral reward. It was a noble morality, delighting in strength, manhood and mastery; and its appropriate result was success in the higher ranks

of life. Now Jesus, in opposition to all this, inculcated a submissive, Quaker-like, tender morality, calculated to conquer by exciting pity, and to disarm opposition by yielding to it. It aimed to rule by love, winning its way by suffering, and triumphing by martyrization. It was to succeed by giving, and not by taking, blood; and to prevail by getting men in a condition to respect the rights of others, instead of matching their strength against the weaker. It contemplated, like Socrates, a persuading of men to the right, and not a forcing of them thereto—a getting of them to reason, and not to pursue a considerateless course in neglect of others. It looked for an agreement of men in interest, and a recognition that another's interest is our own, and not in conflict with it; an interest to be helped, and not to be overcome. Greek virtue lies in *vis* or strength, *vires* or power, *virtus* or bravery. It is fortitude, power of endurance, unflinching persistency. Its exercise consists largely in gymnastics, racing, boxing, and similar feats of strength and prowess, and in intellectual exercises like music, poetry and oratory. The Christian morality, on the other hand, consists largely in self denial, patience, bodily subjection, fasting, and plainness of dress and living; virtues for the people, instead of for the heroes; which the

people can both practice and have the general advantage of. Christ wished, therefore, to effect a revolution in society, by which the submissive virtues, and the persons practicing them, should prevail; a revolution like that partially realized in the monkish regime of the dark ages, and in the Puritanic reign of later times; when virtue and religion were to be popularly esteemed, and asceticism and sobriety practiced of choice; when Diogenism and sanctimoniousness were to be at a premium, and the Roundhead was to be preferred to the Cavalier; when an emaciated Jerome-like saint was to be preferred to the beautiful Apollo, and the *mater dolorosa* to the lovely Venus; when the poor were to rule in a sort of ptocharchy, and luxury and refinement were to be exiled under Blue Law, and mirth and recreation under Sabbath observances. I say such a revolution was, if not in actual contemplation by Christ, at least implied in, and by extreme application drawn from, his policy of bringing the weaker and submissive virtues to the supremacy in the world.

The morality of Christ was accordingly a morality in the interest of the unfortunate, as against the better circumstanced. It contemplated an elevation of the low and miserable, and the getting for them of the conditions of happiness. It

was to be more or less at the expense of the others, as all amelioration is where the evils are evils of society, and the remedy is simply reform. He wished, therefore, to bring the upper classes down, and to bring about a readjustment of society by which the under and oppressed class should be brought uppermost. "Blessed," he says, "be ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God. Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh. Blessed are ye men when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil (low), for the son of man's sake. Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for behold your reward is great in heaven; for in like manner did their fathers unto the prophets. But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now: for ye shall mourn and weep. Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you!"—in short, woe unto you if you are happy, and blessed are you if you are miserable. The summary prophecy of Christ's mission—a reflex of his history—is, that "he hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts. He

hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree. He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away." He himself says, adopting the language of Isaiah, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." He thus sums up the success of his work in answer to the doubt expressed by John in prison that he was perhaps not the Messiah, "Go your way, and tell John," he says, "what things ye have seen and heard: how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached"; also when he says, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy and my burden is light." In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, he shows in the following words his consideration for the unfortunate as against those that have had their good things in this life:

"There was a certain rich man which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day. And there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus, which laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table; moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels unto Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said unto him, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted and thou art tormented."

And then, referring doubtless to the great disparity which separated them in this life, and which could not be spanned in social etiquette, he represents Abraham as saying: "And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence."

Christ had little sympathy with those who exercised the mastery of the world, or with that mastery as found in the prevailing spirit of society. He put himself with the minority, and de-

clared himself out with the world, it being the world that he wished to revolutionize. He accounted himself an exotic, "in the world, but not of the world," and insisted that there was a mutual hatred and irreconcilable conflict between them. "If the world hate you," he said, "ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." He tells his followers that the course which they were to pursue would not be the popular one; but that instead of the sympathy of the world they should have its opposition. "Wide is the gate and broad is the way," he says, "that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; but strait is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." He mapped out a new course, to a new end, with new sympathies, and a new estimate of life. That which was before shunned was now to be followed; that which was before low was now to be exalted, and that which was before weak was now to be strong. The first, he said, should be last and the last first; the high places should be brought low, and the low places exalted; it was, in short, to be a com-

plete reversal of fortunes and readjustment of the social relations.

He discriminated in particular in favor of the poor as against the rich, this being the most common distinction between those who are miserable and those who are happy. He favored in his morality those who were in want as against those who had a sufficiency for life. His great object seems to have been to make the poor happy; which he proposed to do in two ways, first, by elevating them to a better condition, and secondly, by making them more happy in their poverty. He sought first, therefore, to relieve their wants, to raise them when fallen, and to give them hope when desperate; contemplating, as I have said, a reversal of fortunes, in which the under class should become uppermost in society, as is contemplated by all socialistic views and schemes. But he sought also to make them happy in their poverty,—a very necessary provision, since many must necessarily be in this condition under whatever state of society. Christ was the first reformer who proposed to furnish to the world the means of humble happiness, or happiness without the ordinary conditions; substituting morality and its graces and attainments for those of wealth and intellectual and æsthet-

ical culture,—an easier for a harder condition of happiness.

His promises and encouragement are accordingly given to the poor, as in the passages just quoted: "Blessed be ye poor," he says: "for yours is the kingdom of God. Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. * * Blessed are ye when men shall * * separate you from their company"—as the rich generally do the poor,—"and shall reproach you and cast out your name as evil"—as also the higher classes generally do. "Rejoice ye in that day and leap for joy: for behold your reward is great in heaven,"—promises such as social reformers always make to the poor who are their most eager patrons, as well as their most common proteges. "But woe unto you that are rich: for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full: for ye shall hunger. * * Woe unto you when men shall speak well of you," etc.,—in short, woe unto you if you are rich, for you shall lose your riches—threats such as social reformers generally make to the rich who are in antagonism to them on account of their irreconcilable interests. And again, "He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away." "The poor," he tells us,

"have the gospel—or good news—preached to them." "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor." The poor man Lazarus is represented as taken to heaven, and the rich man is sent to hell. In short, Christ had many tender things to say to the poor, but none to say to the rich. The poor were chiefly to profit by his morality, and the rich to be the losers thereby.

In the same spirit, he disparaged wealth as of no great value. He represented it as not containing all the elements of happiness. Though it can furnish homes, luxuries, and other outward surroundings, it cannot furnish the internal and permanent conditions of happiness. A wealthy man is not much happier than a poor man; and a poor man need not be as miserable as he now is. Wealth, moreover, does not stay long in the same person or family; but after it has about disqualified one for being happy without it (through inducing habits of expense and idleness), it leaves him and his family in want and misfortune till several generations have taught them to work and to live in other customs than those of extravagance. Wealth is, moreover, the condition of but few, and not a politic subject for general happiness. Christ accordingly taught that the

conditions of happiness should be something that may be had by all; as virtue, hope, and contentment, which the poor man can have as well as the rich. Jesus was the first to bring a cheap happiness into the world, just as he was to bring a cheap morality; a happiness that can be embraced by the poor, just as a morality that can be practiced by the weak. His object was also, as we shall presently see, to equalize wealth, as furnishing more average happiness than its accumulation by a few. But in all respects he disparaged it with a zeal that borders on communism. "For what is a man profited," he asks, "if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth"; and "The life is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment." He tells the wealthy that their bags wax old, that moths corrupt, and that thieves break through and steal; that the model rich man is a fool, and that the pleasures of the rich are short and unsatisfactory. Why, then, he asks them in substance, do ye spend your life for that which is not bread, and eat the bread which perisheth? and why do ye drink the water that leaves you to thirst again? In great contempt of wealth,

he said that the widow who cast her mite into the treasury cast in more than all the rich who cast in of their abundance.

With something of socialistic instinct, Christ, therefore, depreciated business, industry, and the accumulation of property. He drove the money-changers from the temple, and cast out all them that bought and sold therein, and overthrew their tables, and the seats of them that sold doves. Nowhere has he thought fit to speak a word of encouragement to commerce, trade, or money-making occupations of any kind. He urged none to work for value; whether from the contemplation of a socialistic reorganization of society with all things in common (as was thought by his followers to be implied in his expression, "Seek ye first the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, and all these things shall be added"), or, which is more likely, from the conviction that all such interests would be sufficiently attended to without encouragement, and so only needed checking by him. "Lay not up," he says, "for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal. But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break

through nor steal. For where your treasure is there will your heart be also." He advises his disciples to take nothing for their journey, save a staff only; no scrip, no bread, no money in their purse; but to be shod with sandals, and not to put on two coats. He recommends them also to sell all their goods and give to the poor, that they may have life eternal. "Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth. Take heed and beware of covetousness, for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."

"The ground of a certain rich man," he continues, "brought forth plentifully. And he thought within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have no room to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do, I will pull down my barns and build greater, and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease; eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou fool! this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God."

He tells his disciples that "the cares of this

world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lusts of other things entering in choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful." "Ye cannot," he says, "serve God and Mammon."

"Therefore," he continues, "I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? * * And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore if God so clothe the grass of the field which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Therefore take no thought saying, What shall we eat? or What shall we drink? or Wherewithal shall we be clothed? (for after all these things do the gentiles seek); for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you. Take, therefore, no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

In short Christ could scarcely have said more

than he has said to discourage business and all that leads to wealth and its power. If his followers were to get their share of the goods of the world they would evidently have to get them, in his contemplation, by some other means than by earning them after the usual fashion; whether such means should be charity, revolution, or communism.

But not only did Jesus depreciate wealth and apparently discourage business, but he also threatened the wealthy. He threatened them on the triple ground of the vices of wealth, which self-destroy its own power; of the socialistic changes which were then imminent, and which would take wealth from its present possessors, and devolve it upon others; and finally of the threatened fall of the Roman Empire which would leave all property in chaos, and compel men to live off other support than wealth in its then conditions. At all events he threatened the wealthy as having but a precarious tenure, and sought to turn the people to other conditions of happiness. It was predicted of him, as we have seen, that while filling the hungry with good things, he would send the rich away empty; and he pronounced, while promising all manner of blessings to the poor, all manner of curses on the rich. "But woe unto

you that are rich," he said, "for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you that are full; for ye shall hunger." Of the rich man who had been diligent, and whose lands produced bountifully, and whose barns were full,—a man who exhibited, as far as the record shows, the most faultless conditions of wealth,—he said, "Thou fool! This night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" adding, "And so is every one that layeth up treasure for himself." He likewise related the story of Dives and Lazarus to show a similar fate for the wealthy, as contrasted with the poor, under like faultless conditions of wealth, and meritless ones of poverty. The rich man, he said, was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day; and the poor man, a beggar, lay at the rich man's gate full of sores, desiring to be fed with the crumbs that fell from his table. And the rich man died, and went to hell; and the poor man died, and went to heaven; and all the consolation the rich man got in his misery was the reminder that in this life he had good things and Lazarus evil things, and that therefore now Lazarus is comforted and he is tormented. So when a wealthy young man, who had kept all the commandments, asked Christ

what he must do to be saved, Christ said he must get rid of his wealth: "Yet one thing thou lackest. Sell all that thou hast and distribute unto the poor." "Verily I say unto you," he said, in enforcing this command, "that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say unto you, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." "If any man will come after me," he says, "let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me. And then he depreciatingly asks, "For what is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" while on the other hand he says that "every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake shall receive a hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life."

Christ sought also, in his solicitude for the poor, to turn the hearts of the rich toward them, so as to aid them, and not oppress them. He wished to soften, in particular, the hardness which money induces upon its possessor, especially toward the non-possessor and uninfluential man—the metallic hardness and coldness of business men in their feelings toward the poor. He wanted to break

the rigor with which men deal with their property in making loans, demanding security and forcing repayment. "Give," he says, "to him that asketh, and from him that would borrow turn not away." Give, not as sinners do, who hope "to receive as much again," but give "hoping for nothing." Lend, he says, in effect, without taking security, without taking usury, without taking interest, and without even taking back the principal. "Give hoping for nothing again." "Give and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete it withal, it shall be measured to you again." He teaches men to pray, "Forgive us our debts as we also forgive every one that is indebted to us." He relates the following incident to enforce forbearance on the part of creditors, and cautions them against such hardness as he here portrays:

"Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened unto a certain king, which would take account of his servants. And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him which owed him ten thousand talents. But, for as much as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. The servant therefore fell

down and worshiped him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. Then the lord of that servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him, and forgave him the debt. But the same servant went out and found one of his fellow servants, which owed him a hundred pence, and he laid hands on him, and took him by the throat, saying, Pay me that thou owest. And his fellow servant fell down at his feet, and besought him, saying, Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. And he would not, but went and cast him into prison till he should pay the debt. So when his fellow servants saw what was done they were very sorry, and came and told their lord all that was done. Then his lord, after that he had called him, said unto him, O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me. Shouldst not thou also have compassion on thy fellow servant, even as I had pity on thee? And his lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors until he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."

Christ calls upon the rich generally, as we have seen, to "sell and give to the poor," to "sell and give alms," to give above the requirements of the law, and to give to the deserving and the undeserving, like God, "who sends his rain upon the just and the unjust."

Jesus himself appeared poor, and, like other great popular reformers, seemed to delight in his

poverty. "The foxes," he said, "have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the son of man hath not where to lay his head." His disciples were chosen from the poor, and he kept himself and them in poverty during life. He voluntarily renounced the wealth which he despised in others, and walked in the same obscurity which he counseled upon his followers.

(*b*) *From the Strong to the Weak.*

In the next place, Christ, in his morality for the unfortunate, espoused the cause of the weak as against the strong. We have seen that the Greek morality was heroic, and cultivated corresponding virtues; and that the Christian was submissive, and called for corresponding compassions. Under the Greek morality, the better class of society had the advantages of morality as well as of immorality, and the poorer suffered from its exercise. Christ desired that the people, in the revolutionized conditions of morality which he contemplated, should have the advantages of morality. Under the Greek system, morality was only an aid to those who already had the power, and helped them to keep it, such being the natural effect of fortitude, bravery, persist-

ence, and like virtues. That is, morality was enjoyed principally by the persons who exercised it, it being an advantage to self, and, in this case, to the prosperous and happy. Now Christ wished a morality of which the weak and defenseless should have the benefit; or a morality that should protect this class instead of tyrannize over them.

In fashioning his morality, therefore, Christ put a premium upon weakness, tenderness, simplicity, and childlike dispositions generally—something that had not been hitherto known in morals. "Except ye be converted," he said, "and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings," he said, "thou hast perfected praise." The children were to take a more prominent part in his morality than in any previous system. "Of such," he said, "is the kingdom of heaven." The child, the lamb, and the dove were his symbols. He moved against the strong men of the world with infants in his arms. The tender he believed would triumph over the hardy, the sentimental over the intellectual, the soul over the body. "Fear not," he said, in estimating the two kinds of forces, "them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." He recognized a new force, which

has immunities which physical force has not, and which will work where the latter would fail. "Fear not, little flock," he therefore says; "for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

Christ represented God also as specially caring for the helpless. He introduced a God of the Unfortunate into the moral Pantheon, unlike any of the gods of the Greeks. For, while the Greeks and Romans had gods of every virtue and virtuous character, they had none of the miseries and sorrows of life. "Take heed," he says, "that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven. For the son of man is come to save that which was lost. How think ye? if a man have a hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains and seeketh that which is gone astray? And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that sheep than of the ninety and nine which went not astray. Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." God was represented by Christ as the God of those who need help. Unlike the

gods of the Greeks, who help those who help themselves, and were on the side of the strong, Christ's God helped rather where help was most needed. Weakness called louder to him than strength, and sorrow than joy; so that while the Greeks thought misfortune a sign of divine disfavor, and avoided the victim as accursed, Christ represented it as a pledge of pity, calling for our sympathetic assistance. In the Trojan war, the gods helped the brave; in the Christian warfare, God helps the timid.

Christ taught also, with a view to the same end, that the strong should care for the weak. He wished not only to break their power over them, but to adjust what was left of it for their good, and not for their sorrow. One of the greatest virtues in the Christian morality is to care for the helpless. It is this that is made the condition of heaven. "In as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me." "Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name receiveth me. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you he shall in no wise lose his reward." "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it

were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." * * "Take heed therefore," he adds, as quoted above, "that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."

The reason of Christ's solicitude for the weak and of the incorporation of it in his morals, is, evidently, that the strong can take care of themselves, and so do not need our solicitude. Christ gave a morality, therefore, that did not touch them, or contemplate their advantage; but only that of the helpless. He taught the strong that they ought, with their strength, to defend the weak. They are the ones who have the means of doing ill; and asking them to prevent it is only asking them, as a whole, not to do it. The care of the weak ought to be put upon the strong, since if put upon the weak they could not exercise it.

Greek morality in general injured others, such being the effect of courage, endurance, and the like on our fellows. Christ's morality stopped all injury under the name of virtue, and interpreted it as a vice. Under Greek morality he was the best man who got most men down, and built up

himself on their ruin. Christian morality benefited others, and he was the best man who most served others, or who served most others. "Whosoever will be chief among you," said Christ, "let him be your servant"; and "Whosoever will be great among you let him be your minister." While the Greek sacrificed others for self, the Christian sacrifices self for others. Greek morality had its exercise in games, contests, and wars; Christian morality in tears, balms and joys.

Greek morality recognized a survival of the fittest. Mankind was to be free, and its object was to develop. Man was to be free from moral as from civil law; from conscience as from police; from compassion as from restraint. Let the weak perish, they said, and the strong and good prevail and propagate. Let the deformed and unfortunate be killed that a more hardy, happy and improved race may fill the earth. Christian morality was to help the weak to an equal chance, supplying their lack by our superabundance, and keeping them abreast of the more fortunate by reining back ourselves to their speed. It stopped the war of the natural state of the species, and elevated man out of beasthood into humanity. It asked the strong not to fight the weak, but to

seek other means of support than their destruction or spoliation.

The Greek morality put man in antagonism with man; the Christian ranged all men side by side in the same battle of life, as against a common evil. While Greek morality individualized men, and set them in diverse directions after conflicting interests, Christ's morality was confederative. It sought to bind all in bonds of a common interest, and to unite them in a league offensive and defensive against a common foe—the evils and difficulties of nature and society.

Christ asked men not to individually try their strength as against others; but to act by general laws for the good of all. Mankind are enough alike to have a common interest, and that course of life which secures this is the politic morality in his view.

Recognizing that, as our tastes and feelings become refined, the happiness of the world requires that the contests and hostilities of mankind shall cease, he gives another field for moral exercise than war,—one founded on the peace of the race. Recognizing that the killing, wounding and paining of others, which the law of the survival of the fittest requires, is too revolting for the enjoyment of enlightened

men, he asks that not only wars, but all taking of blood and opposition shall cease; that corporeal punishment, slavery, lawsuits, and all painful antagonisms shall end.

While the Greeks and Romans, under the exercise of their morality, had no asylums or retreats for the aged and decrepit, but rather destroyed them, and destroyed their deformed and sickly children, Christ taught men to nurse and help such through life. Charity and charitable institutions sprang up in the wake of his teachings, and men were turned from destroying each other to feeding each other. The weak got the strong to be their protectors through Christ, and no longer their destroyers, he having translated a jungle of wild beasts into a city of men.

(*c*) *From the Intellectual to the Simple.*

Christ espoused also in his morality the cause of the intellectually weak as against the strong, for, inasmuch as, in an age of enlightenment, physical vigor gives way to mental vigor, and the battle is between intellectual forces, oppression becomes that of the intellectually strong over the intellectually weak. Christ sought, therefore, to bring the intellectually weak to equal enjoyments

and privileges with their superiors. His morality is, accordingly, a disparagement of the powers and arts by which the feebler minds are kept down, and an encouragement of those traits which cannot or will not so oppress them.

He took a decided stand in favor of the simple and impractical, as against the great and crafty. "Blessed," he said, "are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. * * Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth. * * Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven,"—in all cases, Blessed are those who are of no account, and who are to be worsted in the battle of life; for the new kingdom of morality is for them. He made those who cannot maintain their own cause in life, the proteges of his religion;—children, women, and childlike people, who had hitherto little chance in society. Comparing all this class to children, he said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven"; and "Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise

enter therein"; and, "I thank thee, O Father of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes"; also in the prophecy made of his mission, it is said, "He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts; he hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree." And again, in answer to those who were disappointed because of his unpretentious plainness as a great leader, he said, "But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold they which are gorgeously appareled and live delicately are in king's courts"—a class of men entirely different from him and his followers. He frequently inveighed against the learned and professional classes, whether priests, literati or lawyers. I have already quoted his invectives against the priests and scribes (or learned men). Of the lawyers he complained that they use their greater knowledge and sharpness for the oppression of the weaker. "Woe unto you, also, ye lawyers," he said, "for ye laden men with burdens grievous to be borne, and ye yourselves touch not the burdens with one of your fingers. * * Woe unto you lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge. Ye entered not in yourselves, and

them that were entering in ye hindered." St. Paul, speaking of the class of persons who adhered to Christ, said, "Not many wise, * * not many mighty, not many noble are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and base things of the world and things which are despised hath God chosen."

Christ also favored in his morality the humble as against the ambitious, and the various virtues which distinguish the former from the latter. All striving of man against man, and of man for pre-eminence over man, was discouraged by him. "Every one that exalteth himself," he says, "shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." He reproves his disciples for aspiring to greatness, and contesting for the supposed positions in his new kingdom. "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." And elsewhere he says, "Whosoever will be chief

among you, let him be your servant." And he further said that he himself was among them as one who served, and not as a superior; that he came to minister, and not to be ministered unto; and that as a master he would gird himself and serve his brethren, making them to sit down at meat while he should wait upon them. He washed his disciples' feet in humility, and said that they should likewise wash each others' feet; in short he wanted them to keep the spirit of rivalry and ambition out of them, that being a virtue which was to be exercised only in a contest with men, which he wished to abolish from morality.

(*d*) *From the Learned to the Illiterate.*

Christ also, in his morality, favored the ignorant, as against the intelligent, comforting them in their ignorance, and pleading their cause with the learned. The opprobrium which had hitherto attached to the former in society he wished to remove, and their disabilities to relieve. "Blessed," he says, "are the poor in spirit (or the intellectually impoverished), for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." The illiterate, the weak-minded, the impractical were to take a prominence in his morality and have an influence altogether dispro-

portionate to their abilities, it being they who to this day have largely controlled religion, carrying on its revivals, pushing forward its benevolence, and managing its councils. "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth," he says, as already quoted, "because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." By a strange substitute for knowledge he introduced faith as the intellectual power of his religion; something which the illiterate and weak can exercise, and exercise better than the learned; and he rightly calculated that this faculty, which all can wield, would be a stronger motive power than intelligence. Faith in the minds of the illiterate can overcome the knowledge of the learned, whether in controversy or propagation. By it men can have, or believe themselves to have, all the knowledge that others possess, or that they need. By this manœuvre Christ largely dispenses with the necessity of knowledge, and puts the illiterate on an equality with the learned in their own sphere, making ignorance a match for intelligence in religion. For it is to this day a convenient defense that the weak and illiterate have to fall back on faith when they are worsted in argument, or cannot compre-

hend the matter in dispute. Faith is also more nearly allied to our active powers than is intelligence, begetting, as it does, strong convictions and confidence, which men cannot have who calculate too closely, but which are needed in active work. It opens the way for enthusiasm and moral epidemics, like the crusades, missions and modern revivals. When Christ, accordingly, proclaimed faith as a factor in his religion he planted in it the most powerful element of our nature, and secured for it a success and triumph to which no other morality could aspire. He put it in the hands of the people themselves, who are the ones to be moved, and who are most powerful to move others. He accordingly asked men to believe, and to believe without knowing. For if they had to know what they did, the illiterate would be under the same disability as in the morality of Socrates or Seneca. "Go preach my gospel," he says, "to every creature: he that believeth and is baptized (a similar easy condition requiring no intellectual effort) shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." He often refused his contemporaries signs and sufficient proofs of his utterances, and virtually taught them that by practicing religion they would learn all that they need to know in order to prac-

tice it aright. In the meanwhile he said they should follow their feeling—feeling taking, in his system, the place of perception. This principle of faith thus strongly allies Christ's morality with the people, empowering the ignorant with intellectual weapons, without giving them the intellect.

In this interest and spirit Christ was in the next place an impassioned advocate of equality; of social, ecclesiastical, and political equality. He recognized that conventional distinctions work most unfavorably on the lower and weaker classes; and he wished to give every man a chance unburdened by the forms of society; which forms are the chief weight of social oppression, and constitute, with their necessary burdens, almost the entire sum of the evils of the unfortunate. Hence it is said of him, "He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree"; and he says himself of his work that the hills are to be cut down and the valleys to be exalted. The roughnesses of human inequality are to be made smooth. The rich are to sell, and give to the poor. The poor are to have more abundantly, and to have much in common. There is to be less inequality of property as of social and political privileges. He advises his followers to call no man master, and not to be called master by others.

The servant is to be as his lord, and the lord as his servant. He that is greatest among them is to be the servant of all; and whosoever exalteth himself is to be abased, and he that humbleth himself is to be exalted. The workman of one hour is to have as much as the workman of twelve; and every one is to do all he can for the common good, and to get all he needs for himself. No one is to lord it over another, and no one to submit as an inferior. He draws a strong picture of the difference between the then existing inequalities of society and the equal condition of all men in the society which he would establish. "But which of you," he says, "having a servant plowing or feeding cattle will say unto him by and by when he is come from the field, Go and sit down to meat, and will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself and serve me till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?" But he says of himself, "I am among you as one that serveth"; and that under the new state of society the master himself shall gird himself and make the rest sit down to meat while he shall wait upon them. In short, Christ proclaims in the strongest terms, and on the broadest principles, human equality; and in the ex-

tremest democratic sense he declares for equal rights.

In general we may say, with regard to the difference between the Greek morality and that of Christ on this point—the preference of the former for the great and powerful, and of the latter for the weak and ignorant—that the Greek idea was to work your way, earn your position and give an equivalent for what you get. Do all you can, the Greeks would say, against nature and against other men for your own good. Excel, improve, out-distance; take the prize, the crown, the victory; get above, rule, display; get glory, build up greatness, and, in general, achieve success, and delight in it. The Greek idea, as we have said, is a free fight, and the survival of the fittest. Christian morality, however, does not contemplate a strife with others. It is not relative. The word "excel" does not occur in it. Merit is not in being above others. Honor is in individual worth. Act well *your* part, Christ would say, and there is a crown for every one alike. While under other systems it is the best, here it is the good, that is approved. Morality is subjective, as we have seen elsewhere, and is individual and absolute; not measured by another's demerits, but by one's own possibilities.

Greek morality was an exciting and enlarging of our natural inclinations, and of our abilities to gratify them; a nursing of our passions, and development of our faculties; and not a crushing out or dwarfing of anything natural. Use all your strength, and wit, and work, the Greeks would say; discipline and develop yourself; make the most of your powers, and use them to the greatest advantage. Christ, on the other hand, recognized a superfluity and corruption of strength in man, and a tendency to oppress others and endanger himself thereby. He called, therefore, for restraint, sacrifice, and regard for others. While the Greek thought that our powers and inclination to rise needed stimulant, Christ thought that they were too strong, and needed a sedative. Therefore, he said, Hold in yourself; while the Greek said, Let loose yourself. A Greek, if he wanted to crush anything, took somebody else. Christ selected our own desires to be crushed; so that while virtue to the former was largely a gratification, to the latter it was a sacrifice.

The Greek loved the worthy; Christ loved the unworthy. The Greek said, Be something or I cannot love you. Christ said, Be nothing, or I cannot love you. The Greek said, Be a man. Christ said, Be a child. Christ would found love

on pity, rather than on admiration; on the needs rather than on the attainments of humanity; whose proper exercise should be to help, and not merely to congratulate. Man had formerly loved the lovely. Christ taught him to love also the unlovely, and so to give to the unfortunate some of the sweets of being loved.

He taught that happiness in life is to be secured by moral conditions, and not by social or intellectual ones. As the miseries of life, according to him, come from sin, and not from ill-fortune; so the happiness may be obtained by virtue, and not by success. Blessed, he says, are the "poor in spirit," "the weak," "the mourning," "the reviled," and "the persecuted." Christ was the first to teach that happiness, like virtue, is for all. For in his idea the unfortunate may be happy. Happiness is to be gotten by regulating the mind and heart, and not by the outward condition of the individual or society. Therefore it was that he wanted the moral to get possession of the world, as the shortest and cheapest road to happiness.

(*e*) *From the Bold to the Meek.*

I have said that in establishing his morality Christ favored in general the unfortunate as

against the better circumstanced. I observe, in the next place, that under this general principle he favored the meek and retiring rather than the bold and daring; the former being less able to assert their interests and make their way in the world than the latter. "Blessed," he says, "are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for their's is the kingdom of heaven." "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted." "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy." "Blessed are the peace-makers: for they shall be called the children of God"— characters very different from the heroic and warlike ideals which the Greeks admired. Modesty, forbearance, and all such traits as the backward natures show, were encouraged by Jesus. Fear, which was a disgrace in the Greek and Roman morality, became a virtue in the Christian. It was the fear of evil, the fear of temptation, the fear of the world, the fear of the devil, the fear of self, that was to actuate them. Fear, not courage, was their motive. The fear of the Lord was the sum of both religion and morality, and to fear "the wrath to come," the substance of moral prudence,— the fear of God and of the devil being the balance wheels in their moral equilibrium. Evils

that were to be overcome in the Greek morality, were to be avoided in the Christian; and men were to keep themselves unspotted from the world, rather than, like the Greeks, to bear off glorious scars from its conquest. Force was to be conciliated, not antagonized; war avoided, not fought. As Socrates, when he was kicked by the ass, did not think it a proper revenge to kick the ass again, so Christ "when he was reviled reviled not again." He told his followers to resist not evil, but when smitten on one cheek to turn the other, to return blessing for cursing, and to do good to those who should despitefully use them and persecute them. To endure was better than to resist; and to suffer than to dare. The morality of Christ is largely summed up in letting others have their own way, and helping them thereto; that of the Greeks in having your own way, and forcing it from others. Christ asked men to prefer one another; the Greek to prefer self, and even to take care of self at the expense of others.

(*f*) *From the Prepossessing to the Ill-favored.*

Christ discriminated, again, in favor of plainness, homeliness, and deformity, as against beauty

and loveliness. He tried to teach men, as we have seen, to love the unlovely, and found their admiration on something else than the prepossessing qualities which give their possessor such an advantage in the world. Recognizing the power of beauty, as he did that of wealth and intellectual vigor, he sought to reduce it as a force in society, and to supplant it, to that extent, by something of a more general nature. Beauty, and the arts of loveliness which attend it, do for one sex what riches, strength, talent, and boldness do for the other. A beautiful woman has the attentions, admiration, and praises of the world. She moves easily through life, marries early, has the choice of suitors, lives in the higher circles, and in general has the means of happiness to herself; while her less-favored sister often pines in neglect, jealousy, and mortification. Christ accordingly taught men not to estimate beauty too highly, but to esteem instead of it character and conduct. "Judge not," he says, "according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." Beauty was too rare a quality to hang the happiness of one sex upon; and he taught men to esteem something less exceptional, or something which all can possess; as in general he tried to make happiness depend on something in our own will instead of

in the inevitable, which is determined for us. For Christ yearned to place happiness in men's own hands, and to take it out of fate; so that it should be more in our wishes and follow our willingness, instead of being a subject of despair. Under his morality, accordingly, the arts of beauty were, in a measure, proscribed, as the putting on of gold and costly ornaments and apparel. Sack-cloth and ashes were even suggested for dress. The purple and the fine linen of the rich man were despised for the rags of Lazarus, and the phylacteries of the Pharisees for the dishevelment of penitents. Christ taught his followers to take no thought about how they should be clothed, and said to those who were disappointed in his dress, "But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold they which are gorgeously appareled and live delicately are in king's courts" —a class whose style and manner of life he abhorred. His messenger John went in camel's hair and leather; and, as enforcing his idea of plainness, he said, "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you that Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these."

(*g*) *From the Happy to the Suffering.*

Christ also favored the sorrowing and suffering rather than the happy and contented. It was the widow, the orphan, the beggars, and the distressed generally that he cared for, and called upon the people to regard. The fat, laughing, lively, and exhilarated, he passed by without special sympathy. His miracles were generally performed in behalf of the former, and their cry he heard from every quarter. He recognized the fact that the happy own the world and get its good; while the miserable, from whatever cause their misery, are the really poor. He sought, accordingly, to transfer this tenure to the miserable, and give them a draught at life. All those conditions, therefore, which ordinarily conduce to happiness, such as health, vigor, and animal spirits, he depreciated for sadness, faintness, delicacy, and disease. He taught men to esteem and pity such conditions, and taught those in them to take comfort out of them. He tinged happiness with sorrow, and recommended a subdued and sickly joy, rather than a boisterous and exhilarated one. "Blessed," he said, "are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted." "Blessed

are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. * * Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven." Good things in this life, he intimates, will be followed by evil things in the next, and evil things in this life by good in the next; the rich man being tormented hereafter, and the beggar comforted. Christ pointed a joy in every sorrow; and in death, the greatest of all evils, he founded the greatest hope, and proclaimed the completest good. In short, Christ's was a morality for the sick, the mourning, and the dying. "The son of man," he says, "is come to seek and to save that which was lost." "How think ye?" he continues, in defending his policy of confining his concern mainly to the unfortunate; "if a man have a hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that which is gone astray? And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you he rejoiceth more of that sheep, than of

the ninety and nine which went not astray. Even so it is not the will of my Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." And again, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."

(*h*) *From the Few to the Many.*

Christ also favored, in his morality, the many as against the few. For the poor and weak and sorrowful are, after all, the great bulk of mankind; while the wealthy and privileged classes are but a small proportion. As a true economist in morals, therefore, Jesus looked to the interests of the former, as most affecting the bulk of human happiness. He pleaded for the rights of the people, and for customs that would mitigate their condition. He disparaged the privileges of the exceptional classes, and threatened their continuance, saying much that might be construed into socialistic extravagance. Christ was the first to find the conditions of morality in the people generally, and not in exceptional cases of good natural character. The poor, the meek, the mean, the illiterate, the sick, the dying, and the worthless might all be good in their lowness, and

not merely the vigorous types of Greek virtue. It required no strong mind, no vigorous body, no high birth, no good fortune to be a Christian. The slave might be as moral as his master; which was not the case with the Greeks and Romans; and the beggar might stand as high in Christian perfection as Curtius or Alcibiades in Greek.

Thus in general it will be seen that the Christian morality, as distinguished from the Greek, is in favor of the unfortunate as against the better circumstanced; or in favor of the poor, weaker, and more unhappy types as against the richer, stronger and happier.

2. From the Interest of Self to that of Others.

(*a*) *From the Individual to his Fellows.*

I have said that the general distinction between the Greek morality and that of Christ is, that the former was heroic, bold and self-asserting, and the latter tender, loving and submissive. The substance of this distinction, from another point of view is, that the former seeks its own interest, and the latter the interest of others. For in all the heroism of the Greek, and even in his self-

sacrificing, he looked to his own interest. He did his deeds of bravery because they brought glory to him, and because the opposite was a disgrace. If he made sacrifices for his country it was because of the honor which his country returned him, and because of the relation in which his country stood to him as against "barbarians." It was not like the Christian heroism of the Crusaders and knights-errant, who, when they took on something like the Greek spirit and daring, did it in the interest of others—of the poor, the oppressed, the wronged, the suffering, and in general of the class which Christ favored in his morality; for the Christian knights scorned to exercise their functions in their own interest; just as to this day it is thought to be a Christian vice to do good with a view to your own interest. Greek morality, however, was selfish—for self, family, clan, race, country—something that called on self-love as its motive power. Every one therein was for his own ends, with honor for the most successful. Christ, therefore, turned morality outward, and fixed it on others. He called upon men to look away from home to the interest of their neighbors, which was, after all, the principal foundation of the distinction between the heroic and the submissive virtues.

We observe, then, in the next place as a general feature of the morality of Christ, as distinguished from the Græco-Roman, morality, that it was altruistic instead of egoistic; delighting in others instead of self; a passion for their welfare, a sacrifice for their happiness, and, in general, a substitution of them for ourselves in our thoughts and feelings. It is a feeling planted in our nature as an exotic among our personal feelings, having for its object our fellows. We are to love our neighbors as ourselves, and to do to them as we would have them do to us. We are to expend ourselves for others, the work of life being to do good. As the Greek in his morality stood on his honor, the Christian is to stand on his duty; and as the Greek guarded his own rights, we are to guard the rights of others. The whole of Christ's morality, as I shall presently show, is summed up in the one word *love*; and it is the nature of love to be unselfish and good to others. Moral exercise, according to Christ, is not a means of building up one's own interests, but of dispensing them; not an income, but a payment of fortune. Christ taught us that our interests may all be sacrificed consistently with morality, and that they must be so sacrificed if they interfere with our duties to others, sacrifice being one of the most

common duties of Christianity. "If thy right eye offend thee," he says, "pluck it out, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell." It is set forth as the sum of Christ's moral perfection that he gave his life for others. "The good shepherd," he says, "giveth his life for the sheep," and "Greater love hath no man than that he lay down his life for his friends."

While anxious, therefore, for the interests of others in his morality, Christ either prohibited or ignored all interests of ourselves, as well as all interests of classes that are connected with ourselves. His was a morality founded not on natural ties and interests, which in general can take care of themselves, but rather on the unnatural and difficult interests which need special cultivation. Instead of the individual, it was others that he had in view; instead of family and relations, it was neighbors; instead of friends, it was strangers; instead of countrymen, it was cosmopolites. The world, he taught, was to be

our country, mankind our brother, and love our pleasure.

His morality was thus, therefore, in the interest of others, instead of the individual practicing it. He taught us, in such interest, to observe honesty and fair dealing in business; putting others in our place, and acting with them as if with ourselves; saying, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them." Men are to regulate their conduct not by what they can do, but by what they ought to do; not according to their might, but according to the general right; making the wants of others rather than of ourselves the rule of action, reversing therein the morality of the Greeks, who put up self as the standard, as well as the object of conduct. Christ taught, as we have seen, that men should "give good measure, pressed down, shaken together, and running over;" that they should withhold from no man his dues, but give over and above the demand; supplementing justice with charity, and equivalents with surpluses. "For with what measure ye mete," he says, "it shall be measured to you again." Others, not self; gratuity, not return; love, not consideration, were to control in his moral feelings. Man was to be impelled by the heart of another, and to act

as if he had his neighbor's desires. It being easy enough to feel our own wants, Christ taught us to feel others' wants.

(*b*) *From Family to Neighbors.*

In the next place Christ's morality was in the interest of our neighbors instead of our family or relatives. Our love even, was, under his teachings to be unselfish. We are to love that which has no connection with ourselves, and can be of no advantage to us. Christ never gave any commands to love parents, children, brothers, sisters or wives—that was unnecessary—but only to love men. It was our fellows, not our family; outsiders, not our household; mankind, not our kin, that he taught us specially to love. For natural or connectional love, like self-love, besides being sufficiently provided for by nature, is necessarily very limited; whereas Christ's love was to be the love of the world rather than of particular ones, or love most completely of others. Christ does not appear in history as showing any special love for his brothers over others, or as uttering a word of fraternal or filial affection, or as giving commands for any. When twelve years of age he showed himself singularly independent of his

parents, while looking after wider interests; and throughout his whole life he nowhere appears as calling his mother mother, or his brethren brothers. When they said to him that his mother and his brethren wished to speak with him, he replied, "Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?" and we are told that he stretched forth his hands toward his disciples and said, "Behold my mother and my brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." He nowhere appears as calling Joseph father in any sense, but speaks only of his heavenly Father; and almost appears as discouraging such appellations in others. "Call no man your father upon earth," he said, "for one is your father, which is in heaven." On the other hand he threatened the family in its exclusiveness and monopoly of love, and, with something allied to communistic instinct, presaged a partial destruction of its existing relations. "Suppose ye," he says, "that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you nay, but rather division; for from henceforth there shall be five in one house, divided, three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter

against the mother; the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law." And again: "If any man come to me and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple"; a renunciation not only of all selfishness, but, if taken literally, of family love. And, on the other hand, he says to them, "And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, for my name's sake, shall receive a hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life." And when one of his disciples said to him, with something of filial affection, "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father," he answered, "Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead," and in like manner he disapproved of the concern of one who had married a wife, and wanted to take care of her. In short Christ felt that the strength of family love, like that of self love (both being essentially anti-altruistic), was an impediment to his morality rather than otherwise, and needed restraining or directing rather than special encouragement. At all events it never got any impulse from him (except by indirect implications), but got some severe checks in the interest of the rest of the race. Con-

fine not your love, he would say, within a bosom, or a home, or a relationship; but let it spread out to the disconnected ones as well.

(c) *From Friends to Strangers.*

In the next place Christ's morality was in the interest of strangers, rather than of friends. Man is not inapt to love his friends enough; and this love, moreover, is more or less selfish and for a consideration. He therefore gave no encouragement to mutual love, or love for well known or congenial ones. But he called on men to love the friendless. "For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? Do not even the publicans so? Be ye, therefore, perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven, is perfect," that is, love gratuitously and love all. "For he is kind to the unthankful and to the evil." Loving friends, he claims, is too much like lending to those from whom you expect to borrow, and giving with a hope to "receive as much again." He pleaded, therefore, for more gratuity in love. "When thou makest a dinner, or a supper," he said, "call not thy friends, nor

thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor rich neighbors; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame and the blind, and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee." Love of strangers is nearest like love of God, being most unselfish and farthest remote from the lover; for there are moral grades in love: love of self, love of relations, love of friends, love of strangers, and love of God—each in order more remote from self, and more purely altruistic. Christ had no good words for friendship or favoritism among men. Friendship was not one of his virtues, as in fact no love was which did not include all. Christ recognized only love; not love of this one, or that one; but love of every one, and of every kind. If there was any partiality in it, it was in favor of its application to the poor and unfortunate instead of the congenial and prosperous.

(*d*) *From Country to the World.*

And finally, on this point, the morality of Christ was in favor of the whole world instead of one's country or nation. Jesus was cosmopolitan, rather than patriotic; encouraging a love of the

whole earth, rather than of a section; and of mankind rather than of a people. Love of country, though wider than that of friends, is still selfish; being a love, if not altogether of yourself, yet of your own. Men are not disinclined to love their country enough, especially the Greeks, who made it the chief motive to their heroic morality. Half of the miseries inflicted upon others have grown out of patriotism or its allied passions, it being this that has fired the wars and fed the flames of history. Christ wanted men to love all more nearly alike; and not to have a love which consists partly in hating certain classes of others. He taught that God hath made of one blood all men to dwell upon the face of the earth; that there is neither Jew nor Greek in his moral affinities; that the term "neighbor" in his command, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," includes everybody of every nation and race (as he illustrated in the parable of the good Samaritan in answer to the question, Who is my neighbor?) and that (as he taught in the same parable where he makes an enemy love a Jew after his own countrymen had passed him by "on the other side") we should mix up our charities with international liberality, and with sectional and sectarian indifference. Christ made no account of patriotism, not even

admitting it among his virtues; but he rather depreciated it for cosmopolitanism. His morality knows no country, just as it knows no person, no family and no friends; and just as it knows no rank, no condition and no qualities.

Thus, therefore, in general, it will be seen that the morality of Jesus is unselfish, being in the interest neither of the individual nor of any nearly allied to him, but of others, and of others in their farthest remoteness from self.

3. From Hardiness to Kindliness.

(*a*) *From Indifference to Love.*

In the next place Christ emphasized in his morality, as conducive to the submissive virtues and their aims, kindness and tenderness toward others,—virtues very different from those exercised by the brave and heroic Greeks, who often required the sacrifice of others in the assertion of themselves. The morality of Jesus, looking in general to others rather than to self (as well as to the unfortunate rather than the fortunate), sympathized with them in their remotest distresses, and was minutely sensitive to their feelings as well as their

interests. "Blessed," he says, "are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed are the peace-makers: for they shall be called the children of God." "Give to him that asketh, and from him that would borrow turn not away." "And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, I say unto you he shall in no wise lose his reward." "Come ye blessed of my Father," he further says, "inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto ye. For * * inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me." The parable of the good Samaritan teaches the same lesson, contrasting an example of kindness with one of merciless hardheartedness.

"A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment and wounded him and departed leaving him half dead. And by chance there came down a certain priest that way; and when he saw him he passed by on the other side. And

likewise a Levite when he was at the place came and looked on him and passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was; and when he saw him he had compassion on him, and went to him and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn and took care of him. And on the morrow, when he departed, he took out two pence and gave them to the host, and said unto him, Take care of him, and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again I will repay thee. Which, now, of these three thinkest thou was neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves? And he said, He that showed mercy on him. Then said Jesus unto him, Go and do thou likewise."

"Whoso," he elsewhere says, in encouraging the same spirit, "shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea. * * Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven."

Christ taught men to keep themselves, by kindness, from coming into collision with men, and to smooth over their difficulties by mutual concessions. "Blessed," he says, "are the peace-makers:

for they shall be called the children of God;"—peace-makers, not war-makers, such as the Greeks deified, and called the children of the gods, or *divi*. "If thy brother shall trespass against thee," he says, "go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee thou hast gained thy brother." And when Peter asked, "Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him? till seven times?" he answered, "I say not unto thee till seven times, but until seventy times seven." He teaches his followers to pray, Forgive as we forgive; and he says in explanation, "For if ye forgive not men their trespasses neither will your heavenly Father forgive your trespasses." He demands forgiveness before alms, and love before devotion, saying, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there remember est that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." It was kindness applied to the difficult cases that he taught with a view to make life go smoothly and without bitterness.

He likewise taught kindness in financial dealings, and in particular forbearance toward debtors. After teaching men to pray, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," he said that if they

forgave not men, neither would their Heavenly Father forgive them. He related the parable, already quoted, of the hard master, who, having been forgiven a debt of ten thousand talents, refused to forgive a debt of a hundred pence due himself, but imprisoned the debtor, when his lord said, "O thou wicked servant! I forgave thee all that debt because thou desiredst me: shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow servant, even as I had pity on thee?" whereupon he was delivered to the tormentors till he should pay all that he owed. "So likewise," Christ concludes, "shall my heavenly Father do also unto you if ye from your heart forgive not every one his brother their trespasses."

In the same spirit he asked kindness in our judgment, or a ready recognition of others and others' acts as good. For this is, indeed, a great kindness to others; to think well of them being hardly less conducive to their happiness than to do well to them. "Judge not," he says, "and ye shall not be judged; condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven." When the woman was taken in adultery, and the scribes and Pharisees proved beyond doubt her guilt, he appeared not to hear them, and when they pressed the matter upon him, and

demanded that she should be stoned, according to the law, he said, "He that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone at her"; and when they left him, and no one condemned her, he said, "Neither do I condemn thee. Go, and sin no more."

In short, kindness in every form was everywhere and always encouraged by Jesus as the most tender offspring of love, and the chief essence of his morality.

(*b*) *From Revenge to Forgiveness.*

Christ also taught in his morality that men in their loving should love even their enemies, the last and most difficult class to love. He taught, as we have seen, that men should love the unlovely, or love against taste. Here he teaches that they should love the hostile, or love against passion. He not only insisted that we should love all, but he singled out the most difficult cases for love; emphasizing what we would naturally except, and specifying what we would naturally neglect. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that

hate you; and pray for them which despitefully use and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Love was not only to take the place of hate, but to overcome it; not only to supplant it, but to crush it out entirely; hate being the essence of sin, and in no way compatible with morality.

(*c*) *From Opposition to Non-Resistance.*

Christ also taught, as we have already seen, the principle of non-resistance, as not only conducive to, but implied in, the tender and submissive virtues. "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy

coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh, and from him that would borrow turn not away." As you are to love your enemies, and act out that love in beneficence, so you are to conquer their hatred by love, and act out that conquest by non-resistance. Christ thought too much of the sufferers of strife to allow force to be met with opposition. He, therefore, would ease it with a pliable, pillow-like non-resistance, which will destroy its fury, and enjoy rather the reaction than the onslaught. Christ emphasized the happiness which lies in the submissive dispositions of mind, and even the sufferings which it entails, as being above the pleasures of revenge. "Blessed," he says, "are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for their's is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven." Neither the hatred nor the persecution of enemies is to make an enemy of us; but life is to be conquered before love, and we are to

die before we hate. One never gets so low or estranged that he is out of the love prescribed by Christ, which does not need merit to call it forth, whether in the shape of loveliness, goodness, or favor; and which springs up spontaneously from within ourselves, and is strong enough, not only to flow without outward motive, but also to overcome the opposite, whether it be the unlovely, or the antagonistic.

(*d*) *From Interested to Disinterested Benevolence.*

In the next place Christ taught disinterested benevolence. He wanted men to love for the loved one's sake; not for the lover's. Placing in general the good of others instead of ourselves as the object of his morality, he thought that it vitiated the virtues to mix them with interest. He would, therefore, have us not only to love our neighbor as ourselves, but in that love, to love our neighbor instead of ourselves. Since moral conduct (good deeds) is generally done toward the poor and uninfluential, and cannot therefore be returned as favors, disinterestedness seems necessary for the purposes of Christ's morality. If we did good to a higher class we might expect as much again, and interested morality would be

more proper. Christ, therefore, tells us to do good, and expect nothing. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them": not what they do to you, which would be justice; or what you expect them to do to you, which would be interest; but what you would have them do to you, which is gratuity. "For," he continues in a passage already quoted, "if ye love them which love you what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them. And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same. And if ye lend to them from whom ye hope to receive, what thank have ye? for sinners also lend to sinners, to receive as much again. But love ye your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again, and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be the children of the Highest: for he is kind to the unthankful and the evil. Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful." He did not teach that virtue is exclusive of reward, but only that we are not to do it for reward. For he set forth the double truth that virtue is a good thing for the doer, and that it is to be rewarded by God also; saying, "Give and it shall be given you." "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged; condemn not, and ye shall

not be condemned; forgive, and ye shall be forgiven. * * For with the same measure that ye mete it shall be measured to you again"; in short, that it is better for the virtuous to be virtuous. But while he taught this reflex benefit of virtue, he never set it forth as a motive. For, though it is difficult to discriminate between the reason for doing good and the motive thereto, Christ clearly drew the distinction, and showed that it is one thing to know that right action will be for our good, and another to have an inclination to do it. Christ, therefore, would have the desire for good incorporated in our nature; so that we shall do good voluntarily, and without consideration of the advantage to ourselves. Virtue contains a reward in itself, but you are not virtuous if you look to that reward. Honesty is the best policy, but it is not honest to work on that principle. Parental love is beneficial alike to parent and child; but it is not genuine parental love if exercised for such consideration. Christ taught uncompromisingly that the motive to morality must be in others, not in ourselves; and that the desire for others' good, though felt by us, must consider only them. A love that is self-enjoying, or exercised for the pleasant sensation it gives to the lover, and not for the pleasure of the beloved,

is ungenuine. The man who loves because it is grateful to him and not to the object, or who does good because it is profitable to him and not to another, is not moral in Christ's view. Christ's virtue is a compassionate sense of others' wants calling to us, their appetites felt by us, and in general their desires made sensitive in us. Selfishness in morality can never be reconciled with the ideas of Christ. Whatever else one may do for profit, he may not do good for it. But to do good that advantage may come to self, is an adultery committed by two virtues, deflowering them both.

And finally, Christ's morality in its highest generalization, is nothing but love; love being the great central idea from which his principles radiate, and the universal object to which they tend. Greek morality expressed, in its rivalries and contests, a hatred or indifference to others; Christ's morality expressed, in its charities, a benevolent concern for others. Men, under Christ's idea, were no longer to be the arena for conflicts, but for kindnesses; no longer the characters of a tragedy, but of a divine comedy. They were to be reconciled and confederated, not antagonized. There was to be a oneness of the race, including a unity of our interests and feel-

ings. The altruism of humanity was to be henceforth part of each one's identity. The moral gravitation of the world, discovered by Jesus, was to be incorporated into our moral thought; the universal currents of social sympathy, touched by him, were to electrify the encircled brotherhood of man. In the few instances where he generalized duty, and summarized all ethical feeling, it has been in the word "*love.*" "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." The first commandment is love; the second commandment is love; and the two commandments are one; love of God and love of man being generalized by Christ into one affection, which, as he says, is like to either; so that the whole duty of morality, and of religion, too, is simply loving thoughts and acts.

Such, therefore, in general is the morality of Jesus as a departure from the Græco-Roman morality; a submissive, tender, non-resistant, humble and unselfish morality, as contrasted with the bold, daring, vigorous, revengeful, and self-assert-

ing morality of the Greeks. Christ recognized life as a peaceful state, calling for the virtues of peace; not as a warlike state, calling for the virtues of war. He saw men in sorrow, sickness, and death: and he designed his morality for their relief; not in health, vigor and happiness, as the Greek morality did, which adjusted itself to that key. Christ endeavored to meet the neglected cases, or the wants of men overlooked by Greek morality. And, although we might, to fill up the full measure of morality, profitably revive the virtues neglected by Christ, such as courage, fortitude and ambition, and their manifestation in games, poetry, painting, and music, yet Christ designedly depreciated these from their immoderate proportions, and called for more of the complementary virtues. He saw the wants of morality to be in the direction of compassion; and he threw his weight on the side of the lacking to produce an equilibrium. He saw a need of more peace, more attention to the unfortunate, and more love; and he inculcated the virtues which should bring these about.

In conclusion we may say, concerning the morality of Christ as a whole, or its triple departure

from the Mosaic, the Pharisaic, and the Græco-Roman morality, that it was respectively a protest against political morality, against ecclesiastical morality, and against secular morality, or against being conformed to the state, to the church, and to the world. With regard to the first he wanted more morality; with regard to the second he wanted less nonsense in morality; and with regard to the third he wanted a different kind of morality. Christ had to deal with children, with fools, and with worldly men. With reference to the first he said, Don't fall short in morality; with reference to the second, Don't do the useless in morality; and with reference to the third, Don't do the wrong in morality; or, expressed in positive forms, Do all the good you can; be practical in it; and do it in love instead of interest. The whole of Christ's morality summed up is simply duty, common sense, and love.

The opposite of Christ's morality was sin, whereas the opposite of Moses' morality was crime, of the Pharisaic morality non-conformity, and of the Græco-Roman morality dishonor; and Christ asked men not to sin as being the most complete guaranty against all the evils of immo-

rality; the minuteness and delicacy of the distinctions of sinlessness, in its sensibility to wrong and suffering, insuring the most general moral uprightness.

JUN 3 1934

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 022 208 270 5